

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 16, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, You have created the whole world and You have made us in Your own image. You have breathed into us the very breadth of life and You have nurtured us along the way of life. We respond to Your mighty acts with thanksgiving.

As Your greatest gift to each person on every side of every conflict, O God, is the gift of life, so we earnestly pray for peace. May the aggressors in every place turn away from their evil, may not the stronger sides force their will on the weaker and may each person share in the freedom of spirit that is their rightful and holy heritage.

We are aware of the burdens that our leaders bear at this time and so with one voice we pray for our President to whom great responsibility has been given. May Your spirit, loving God, that transcends all the differences between peoples, guide, guard and gird him and all our leaders in the paths of justice and of peace.

We place these prayers before You, O God, together with the secret petitions of our own hearts. All of this we pray in Your holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON] to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAXON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

HOPE AND PRAY FOR PEACEFUL SOLUTION TO MIDEAST CRISIS

(Mr. McNULTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, the deadline for Iraq to get out of Kuwait which was stipulated by U.N. Resolution 678 has now passed. I think it is

appropriate to reflect on the meaning of that deadline.

January 15 was indeed a deadline for Saddam Hussein, and he must wait and wonder and worry every day, and indeed every hour, from this point forward about what the United States and its allies might do next. It was not, however, a deadline for us. We are not required to take any specific action today, or tomorrow, or on any other date certain.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to continue to exercise restraint so that Saddam Hussein may reflect on the consequences of his actions and that he may reach the conclusion which has been reached by people throughout the civilized world; that in the event of a military conflict, he loses. And, having reached that inescapable conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we can only hope and pray that Saddam Hussein will make the decision to order the withdrawal of his troops from Kuwait and to end this crisis peacefully.

THE COMMUNIST WAR AGAINST LITHUANIA

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, various news reports from beleaguered Lithuania confirm what many of us have long suspected: The Communist government of the Soviet Union has reverted to form.

The ghost of Lenin must be smiling as he sees his Mr. Gorbachev once again using the party's ultimate argument against people who want to be free.

The New York Times this morning says:

It appears that the script has precedents in Soviet political strategy dating to the Bolshevik Revolution.

The script is still the same: provoke quarrels, create an incident, and then respond by sending in tanks to crush freedom. Budapest in 1956. Prague in 1968. Vilnius in 1991.

Gorbachev has had to choose between the road to the future and the road to the past.

He has chosen to ride a tank down the road to the past, waving his Nobel Peace Prize as he passes by.

THE GULF WAR POSES DANGERS FOR OUR CIVIL LIBERTIES

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in the Persian Gulf is fraught with many dangers, but I want to draw attention to the danger to our civil liberties here at home. We support the FBI's antiterrorism efforts and we want the Bureau to be vigilant, but we must caution the FBI and the other agencies in the Justice Department to avoid overreaction.

I intend later today, after the 1-minute, to take out a special order to raise this issue and send a warning to my colleagues, to the executive branch and to the American people.

We must be alert to the threat that the gulf war and the fear of terrorism will result in an overreaction, making our Nation less free. It would be a tragedy if Americans were to give up some of their freedoms to restore the freedom of Kuwait.

ALL PEOPLE SHOULD BE FREED FROM YOKE OF TYRANNY AND REPRESSION

(Mr. PAXON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, while the attention of the world is focused on momentous issues of war and peace in the gulf, Soviet President Gorbachev has made a mockery of his Nobel Peace Prize by brutally repressing the movement for freedom and independence in the Republics of Lithuania and Latvia.

Gorbachev's timing is no accident. As they did in Budapest in 1956, in Prague in 1968, now again in 1991 the Red Army has fired on freedom fighters, this time in Vilnius, men, women, and children, armed only with sticks, the desire for freedom, and their courage.

As long as the crisis in the Middle East continues, our ability to affect the course of freedom in the Baltics, as well as other foreign policy issues with equal moral weight, is seriously compromised.

All peace loving peoples of the world continue to hope and pray that the tyrant Saddam Hussein will end this crisis in what little time remains. If he does not, however, we must all understand that the overwhelming imperative we face to use appropriate force to bring about Saddam Hussein's end quickly is drawn not solely from Middle East issues, but from the issues of freedom and independence for all people who fall under the yoke of tyranny and repression.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

AMERICA MUST KEEP FAITH WITH LATVIA, LITHUANIA, AND ESTONIA

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here in Washington today, all of us, thinking about the same thing, the Mideast, as those all around the world are thinking of what is going to happen. Those that pray are praying that there is still time for a peaceful solution. But in the meantime, we can think about January 15, 1990, when all of us were so excited and so pleased that communism was taking a turn, that countries like Hungary and Czechoslovakia, Poland, would now be able to be free again. We all knew that those other countries, particularly the Baltic countries, were going to also follow suit, and find their voices of freedom.

So, today we must join our voices with theirs. We must join in their faith, that they can take off the yoke of communism and be free, too. We must keep faith with our neighbors of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

We must send a clear, unambiguous message from the Congress of the United States when we begin our work later in the month. There is no such thing as business as usual. Most favored nations, that cannot be when we have a situation like this.

Of course, we do not want people to go hungry in the Soviet Union, but can we stand shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union when tanks are going forward over people of Lithuania? No, we cannot. So this is a serious day all over the world. But we must remember we were the ones that held strong against communism, and we are going to have to be the ones to continually stay with those countries that now want their freedom, too.

□ 1210

AID TO EL SALVADOR

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the President's announced decision that he will release \$42.5 million in military aid to the Government of El Salvador within 60 days if the FMLN Communist guerrillas do not clearly indicate their good faith negotiations to bring about peace.

This Congress withheld that \$42.5 million in the foreign aid bill last August attempting to send a signal to the FMLN asking them to go to the peace table. But by withholding that military aid we simply encouraged the FMLN Communist guerrillas to launch their fall offensive, which they did on November 20, and the result of that is 700 people have been killed, 1,200 people

have been wounded, civilian targets have been blown up and indeed, Sandinistas from Nicaragua have sent SAM-14 missiles which have been used by the Communists in El Salvador. Indeed, just a few weeks ago the FMLN killed, murdered two U.S. soldiers flying their helicopter on a peaceful mission, and indeed, even more outrageously, added to that atrocity by attempting to murder the Army investigative team we sent down there to look into the atrocity.

So the President has acted responsibly, and I hope that, although I doubt, I nevertheless hope that the FMLN Communist guerrillas will finally get the message, go to the peace table and negotiate peace in El Salvador.

ANNUNZIO CALLS FOR IMPROVED ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the efforts of this Congress to make quality health care available to all Americans.

Nearly 35 million Americans, including senior citizens, now have no health insurance. Many of them are now doing without proper medical care.

The results of a new study published in the Journal of the American Medical Association have confirmed my worst fears about this problem.

The study was led by researchers from Georgetown University. They looked at the records of nearly 600,000 hospital patients from across the country.

The study appeared to show that Americans who don't have insurance are nearly twice as likely to die during hospital stays than those who do have insurance.

To address the problems made clear by this study, I am cosponsoring the Universal Health Care for All Americans Act. If enacted, this bill will guarantee basic health care for all Americans, regardless of age or income.

The bill also includes a system to control costs so it won't add to the national debt.

GORBACHEV SHOULD EARN HIS PEACE PRIZE OR GIVE IT BACK

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, far to the north of the Persian Gulf, ignored by much of the world, a tragedy is unfolding.

The leaders of the Soviet Union are trying to crush the peaceful movement

of the Baltic nations toward independence.

When Foreign Minister Shevardnadze resigned last month, he warned the world of a coming dictatorship. And this week, we've seen it begin to emerge. Thirteen young Lithuanians are dead, shot or crushed by tanks when the Soviet army took over the Vilnius radio station. Eighty more are missing.

In Riga, Latvians defending their government's buildings have been beaten and arrested. And President Gorbachev suggested this morning that he might suspend the freedom of the press. If he doesn't hear us now, worse is to come.

I say to Mr. Gorbachev, so recently awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace: The people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia seek only the right to determine their own destiny.

Your government has denied them that right for 50 years, but the days of Stalin are gone and cannot return.

If you want to move forward, you will have our support; if you take your country back into the past, you will not. No aid, no trade credits, no most-favored-nation status. Nothing.

You can still avoid disaster, if you listen to the voices of reason and reject this fateful course. Listen to President Yeltsin of Russia. Listen to the marchers outside the Kremlin.

Listen to the people of the republics. Listen to the veterans of the Afghan war, who can tell you the cost of denying a nation its freedom.

Mr. Gorbachev, earn your Nobel Prize or give it back. Step back from the brink while you still have time.

SITUATION IN EL SALVADOR

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, President Bush decided yesterday to release \$42.5 million military assistance for the democratic Government of El Salvador because the Communist FMLN guerrillas have received significant outside supplies of weapons and have engaged in acts of violence directed at civilian targets. The administration has decided, however, to withhold obligation of the funds for 60 days in order to pressure the FMLN to agree to a cease-fire. If a cease-fire is reached, the aid will not be sent.

I strongly support this decision by President Bush. He has fulfilled the letter and the spirit of the El Salvador provisions in Public Law 101-513. The United States cannot stand idly by when the FMLN has launched an offensive which has resulted in more than 1,000 deaths. And the United States cannot stand idly by when the FMLN brutally assassinated two American servicemen in cold blood. If President

Bush did not act, the FMLN would escalate their senseless violence and more innocent people would die.

This body has heard much talk recently about giving peace a change. The President's decision not to disburse the military aid for 60 days does just that—it allows maximum pressure for an end to the Salvadoran war. The Central American Presidents, the Congress and the Salvadoran people have spoken for peace. It is now up to the FMLN to decide if they genuinely desire peace. If further military aid is sent to El Salvador, it will be due solely to FMLN intransigence.

MOBILIZING THE HOMEFRONT IN SUPPORT OF OUR TROOPS

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the whole world is now in a no man's land timewise between the deadline of January 15 and the beginning of hostilities if they should come. And while our young people are mobilized in the sands of Saudi Arabia, we ought to be taking this time now to quietly begin to mobilize the homefront. We ought to be gathering our churches, communities, our Red Cross, and other entities within our communities for the purpose of establishing contacts with the families and support mechanisms for those families of our service people and to provide for communications, and updates, and to do all we can here at home to first of all demonstrate our support for our Armed Forces, and second, to make sure that the families who are left behind will also have the full measure of community entities keeping in touch with their loved ones and with the Government entities that are in charge of this enterprise of Desert Shield.

We on the homefront can do just as we have always done before: Give that superb support to our Armed Forces that they deserve.

EQUITY IN THE FDIC

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I realize that today as we are just a few hours after the passage of the January 15 deadline that much of our attention is focused on international issues, particularly those events in the Middle East. However, I would like to call to the attention of Congress and the Nation concerns about some domestic issues, and particularly one that was brought about by virtue of a decision of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation yesterday.

As many know, when the Bank of New England a few weeks ago shut down, the FDIC was able to give all depositors 100 percent of their deposits, while in the case of Freedom National Bank, which closed in December, they only gave 50 percent in addition to that which measured up to \$100,000.

We believe that is an inequitable process and the FDIC agreed that that was the case. Today we come and ask that Members of this body join me as I introduce House Resolution 482 so that we might make sure that all of the citizens of this land understand that there are no policies which disregard some citizens while regarding fully those other citizens, and responding to them by giving them full return on their deposits.

We believe that this is an inequitable and unfair practice, and the FDIC says that it cannot act without some kind of legal guidelines from the Congress. Therefore, it is my hope that we will work together to try to solve this inequity so that all persons depositing in all banks will understand that the FDIC indeed insures them fully for their deposits.

□ 1220

NO. 2 MAN IN MEDELLIN CARTEL SURRENDERS

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, as tensions continue to rise in the Middle East, Colombia persists in her own struggle. The drug war in Colombia, which not long ago was on everyone's lips, unfortunately still endures unabated. Yesterday, marked an historic milestone in the drug war in Colombia. Jorge Luis Ochoa, the No. 2 man in the Medellin cartel surrendered to government officials.

Though this development is certainly cause for celebration, I do have some serious reservations. Ochoa's surrender, like his brother's surrender last month, was prefaced on the Colombian Government's assurance that drug traffickers would not be extradited to the United States and would receive lenient court treatment.

The extradition of drug traffickers has been the backbone of American international antidrug policy for one very important reason. The combined wealth and terrorist capabilities of these drug lords dilutes the ability of their domestic judicial system to effectively prosecute and punish them. However, if a promise or nonextradition is needed to facilitate the surrender of these murderous criminals, then so be it.

We all want these criminals brought to justice. We all want an end to their deplorable illicit drug trafficking. We

welcome reports of Ochoa's surrender and to hear grumblings of Pablo Escobar's anticipated surrender.

Mr. Speaker, the Medellin cartel, is the largest drug trafficking network in the Americas. This cartel has claimed responsibility for thousands of murders and assassinations and numerous bombings. If Ochoa is convicted of merely one one-thousandth of these crimes, he still deserves at least life imprisonment.

Once again, I applaud this preliminary Colombian triumph, but the Colombian judiciary must act strongly. Any punishment short of what these murderers deserve would simply be unjust. If Colombia does not inflict severe penalties upon the surrendered traffickers then there will be no disincentive for these criminals to continue their abominable trade, and nothing will have been gained.

MAJORITY OF OUR MEN AND WOMEN STATIONED HALFWAY AROUND WORLD READY TO ENSURE WORLD SECURITY

(Ms. MOLINARI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, last night as the U.N. resolution deadline for Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait was realized, the world spent a restless night as our clocks chimed 12, and America began its lonely, hopeful vigil.

For many Americans, there is an eerie familiar mood in this country today. They remember the shock of Pearl Harbor and the cruel dictates of Adolf Hitler. They will never forget practice air raids, newsreels from the changing face of Europe, and the sorrow of losing loved ones. For some, this national preparation is without personal precedent. There are generations who have enjoyed every day of our lives as recipients and beneficiaries of wars gone by, as beneficiaries of difficult decisions made from the President in the Oval Office to the private on the frontline.

Our generation has been rocked out of its peaceful slumber, however, by threats of international destruction. Every man, woman, and child in our community of nations is Saddam Hussein's target of terroristic threats.

Mr. Speaker, clearly I am one of those fortunate Americans who has known peace in my lifetime due to the strength and resolve of my parents and grandparents, so ironically are a vast majority of our men and women now stationed halfway around the world, ready to do what they must to ensure world security for the next generation.

For them we stand here as Americans, we pray, for a tomorrow as free as was our recent past. We hope and we wait.

CONGRESS AND AMERICAN PEOPLE SOLIDLY BEHIND PRESIDENT

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, since last Saturday, you have supported the President now that Congress has acted on the Persian Gulf.

I commend you, from the bottom of my heart for it, because partisanship should stop at the water's edge.

And I would urge the entire Congress to follow your outstanding example. Unfortunately there are some of us who do not.

One way to do that, would be for each of us to urge our constituents to write to our troops in the Mideast.

Let us show the troops that we care, that we appreciate their sacrifices and the hardships they are going through.

Mr. Speaker, while in Saudi Arabia last week, I talked to hundreds of those young men and women, and I sure am proud of them all.

I am also very proud of what one community in the 24th District of New York has done.

On Monday past the town board of Dresden in Washington County, NY, led by Supervisor Joseph T. Rota, unanimously passed a resolution supporting the congressional decision granting the President the authority to enforce U.N. Resolution 678.

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that the yes-men surrounding Saddam Hussein do not dare tell him about the Dresdens in northern New York and other towns across America.

Whether he knows it yet or not, the American people and the American Congress are solidly behind the President of the United States of America. God bless him and our troops overseas.

WE WILL NOT SIT IDLY BY AND CONDUCT BUSINESS AS USUAL

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it was something over a year ago when most of us recall the image on television of a young man in China, in Tiananmen Square, who stepped in front of a line of tanks and stopped them from breaking up what was a large demonstration for peace in China. The Chinese authorities and army, of course, eventually broke that demonstration, killed apparently thousands of Chinese students, young people, and others who yearned for and demonstrated for freedom.

The message, I think, tragically from us and others around the world, is we did not like it but there will be business as usual, the justification was

that vital interests rise above human rights.

Mr. Gorbachev may have seen that and recognized that the United States often responds in such a manner. Mr. Gorbachev should now understand that in his treatment of the citizens of the Baltic States there will not be business as usual. We should not have done it with China. I assert that we must not do it with the Soviet Union.

We must, it seems to me, link human rights with this country's foreign policy. We must raise our voice to tell all of those around the world who would kill and otherwise maim their citizens who yearn and strive for freedom and seek to shed the yoke of tyranny, communism, and oppression that we will not sit idly by and conduct business as usual with those regimes.

TROUBLING OCCURRENCES IN THIS COUNTRY AND AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents called me a day or so ago and said that in the shadow of the darkness of potential war in the Persian Gulf she felt the need to speak out and to say something, but she said, "I really do not quite know what to say." I think that is the way many of us feel across this country, and especially here in Congress. We wait and we wonder, and we pray that in one way or another war will be averted.

I do not take the well today to rediscuss or debate the merits or demerits of one strategy versus another, but I am, and have been in the past evenings, increasingly troubled by what is happening in this country and around the world. I do so fully understanding, the gravity of the situation.

□ 1230

I guess the process by which the American people and the world are being informed, and the process by which all of this is being laid out is very troubling. This is not diplomacy in a traditional sense, using words of persuasion to avert the use of weapons of war. It is not the traditional kind of contacts between countries. It is almost ratings week on our television stations.

We see daily polls, and the polls are trumpeted that the American people feel this way or that way, this morning or this afternoon. There are television specials. There are lines in the sand. There are deadlines and stopwatch diplomacy. It is unsettling.

This should not be a game of international confrontation played out on "Night Line," trying to connect world leaders through the device of tele-

vision. It is a real and deadly potential committing the young people of our countries to war and conflict.

Everyone agrees the invasion of Kuwait was dreadful and cannot be allowed to stand. Saddam Hussein must be stopped, and he now is stopped. He is going nowhere. The question is, what tactic do we employ to move him back?

This Congress, without my vote, authorized the President to use force. It did not require him to use force. I still hope that in the hours ahead, one way or another, President Bush, Saddam Hussein, and others involved will find a way to resolve this peacefully.

Two nights ago I watched a television special that I believe was entitled "Countdowns to War." It was trumpeted as a very big special. It had a lot of the extras, the lighting and the maps that commentators exit in. It was ironically sponsored on television by a Japanese auto company, which I watched with some interest.

Our allies, especially including the Japanese and not Western allies, are doing nowhere near what they ought to be asked to do, and required to do in the Persian Gulf. Whether war comes, or whether the crisis is resolved—we preferably hope that it is—there will almost certainly be the requirement of a longer term peacekeeping force in the Persian Gulf. The question is who, who bears the risk? Who pays the cost of war for a peacekeeping force? It has largely become an answer from our allies that, "You do it, Uncle Sam. You take care of it. We will certainly cheer lead. We will help. We will contribute a little from our checkbooks, but you send your children." However, this should be the job of the United Nations—not the United States alone.

There is something wrong with that. Even, it seems to me, more difficult for the people of the free world to understand is precisely what this is about? Naked aggression? Yes. But does anybody really believe that a country that is one-tenth of the size of the State that I represent here in Congress, would command the movement of 400,000 American troops, and the kind of force and might that exists, if that country were raising artichokes and pineapples? No, of course not.

Naked aggression would be revolting even then, but artichokes and pineapples would not command the movement of troops to the Persian Gulf under those circumstances. The issue is oil, and the question for all citizens in this country to ask ourselves today, especially as we buy bigger cars and have no effective American conservation program, is "at what price oil? At what price in human lives? What is our long-term responsibility here in the area of energy programs and conservation, and the area of determining and trying to evaluate what our vital interests are in the long term in the Persian Gulf."

My hope is that the television specials, all of this trumpeting, all of the hype, all of the polling aside, that we will once again in the hours ahead see the professionals, the diplomats, the people who work with a quiet certainty about how to get things done, attempt in a thoughtful way to resolve this crisis through words of persuasion rather than through the use of weapons of war.

LIFE IS PRECIOUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Madam Speaker, let me, before I start, commend my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], on a very excellent statement. It certainly summarized the concerns and the difficulties all Members have had in wrestling with this issue of life and death in a context in which, with the greatest of respect to the media, it appears to be just an episode on television of "China Beach" or "MASH" or some such television show.

While it is important that the information get out to the people, and I believe we have the greatest land in the world because we have the greatest and the freest media in the world, I think we have to be very careful not to allow a rush to produce information, upon which the American people can base their decisions, to somehow recast what could happen today, what could happen a moment from now, but dear God, I hope does not happen ever, which is a war, a real, honest, shooting, bloody, killing war. Not a television special, but a bloody, killing war, which will take the lives of our men and now our women, at the flower of their youth, at the flower of their talents and abilities.

Madam Speaker, as is my custom and habit two or three times a week to stop over at St. Peter's Church on the way into the office in the morning, just to sort of get my head straightened out, just so that I am reminded periodically of what life is really all about, and what the values of life are, and what the important elements of life are, unfortunately in the welter of activities and the hustle and bustle of Capitol Hill, it is all too easy for Members to forget what life really is.

As I was at St. Peter's this morning and thinking of how blessed we are in this land and how personally blessed I am, my wonderful family, and the health we have, and I was thinking that today is my mother's birthday, and I am so pleased and happy and blessed with her, I was trying to think what should I be doing about the gulf. And, I was praying for the President, as all Members are, that he continue to have the stamina and the health and the wisdom and the insight to deal

with these immense and terribly vexing problems, these immense weights on his shoulders. And, I prayed for him and his family.

While President Saddam Hussein and I profess to a different religion and to a different god, I think each of our gods has one idea about life. That life is precious. Human life is precious. Human life should not be sacrificed. So, I pray for Saddam Hussein that somehow in the midst of all this difficulty and tension and stress and madness—yes, madness—that somehow there is some moment of reflection which might cause a change in his attitude so that we would avert a war.

I was thinking just this morning what picture would, if I were to call a picture into Saddam Hussein's brain, what picture would I call? I would not call the picture of the armament that we have massed, which would clearly obliterate him and his country, but I would call the picture of the beautiful children of Iraq.

Once again, in all of this television, we tend to forget this is not a nation without a rich history. This is not a nation without a rich tradition, without a very rich civilization. After all, the cradle of civilization is where the Tigris and the Euphrates Rivers come to confluence, and that is in the nation of Iraq, where we have the earliest of civilizations.

I would call into Mr. Saddam Hussein's head the pictures of the beautiful Iraqi children, the boys and the girls, the innocents, because let me tell Members this will not be a television war, but this will be a real war, and the victims of this real war will be the innocents: the children, the boys, and the girls.

□ 1250

And so, Madam Speaker, I would hope that at this point when it is very difficult to believe that somehow we can avert a war, I hope and pray that we can. And, I hope and pray that our leader in this United States, our great President, is willing, if need be, to exercise the restraint and the courage to step back from the edge of war if one more day, one more hour, one more minute might somehow provide a peaceful solution.

And I would ask our adversary in this if he would think of the beautiful children of his land whose lives would be taken away, the flower of his country.

I hope, Madam Speaker, that all of us in this Nation will be able to continue to enjoy our freedoms without having to have a war that would cost us so very dearly.

THE GULF WAR AND THE THREAT TO OUR CIVIL AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Madam Speaker, as the Nation faces the prospect of war, I am deeply worried about the impact on freedom in this country.

It is a sad fact of history that every foreign policy crisis has generated domestic fear, which in turn has led to an erosion of individual rights. Early in our history, a Congress fearful of French and British hostility enacted the infamous Alien and Sedition laws. After World War I, Attorney General Palmer, seeing Russian revolutionaries in domestic social and political unrest, jailed hundreds of activists. As World War II began, loyal Japanese-Americans went to prison camps. In the 1950's, the onset of the cold war saw the birth of new sedition laws, McCarthyism and congressional witch hunts.

Today, we must ensure that history does not repeat itself. We must be alert to the threat that the gulf confrontation and fear of terrorism will result in an overreaction here at home, making us less free.

We want the FBI to be vigilant, and we support the FBI's antiterrorism efforts. But we must avoid infringements on our civil liberties. I would note the advice of William Webster, now the CIA Director. When he was FBI Director, Judge Webster warned against the danger of overreaction to the threat of terrorism. He stated in 1985, "A government that reacts to terrorism by repressive measures and suspends individual liberties plays into the hands of terrorists." On another occasion, Judge Webster noted, "To barricade ourselves is to let the terrorists win on the cheap."

The remarks of Judge Webster are important today. As a result of FBI programs initiated under his calm and measured leadership, terrorism has been largely kept from American soil. The number of terrorist incidents in the United States has declined dramatically, from over 100 a year in 1977 to less than 10 a year since 1987. In 1989, we had only four terrorist incidents on American soil. Even more remarkably, there has not been a single terrorist incident in the United States by a foreign group since 1983.

The FBI achieved these remarkable results by applying ordinary law enforcement methods in a calm and measured way. That is what we want them to continue doing. We want them to continue focusing their efforts on criminal conduct and suspected crimes.

However, last week, there was an ominous sign when the FBI began to contact ordinary Arab-Americans—citizens—and ask them what they knew about terrorism. I have received calls of concern from Arab-Americans in my district and from national organizations of Arab-Americans. They are upset and confused by the Bureau's actions.

The FBI should not have a special program aimed at Arab-Americans. Interviewing people on the basis of ethnic origin has an aura of discrimination that is not appropriate in our country. Arab-Americans are no more prone to violence than other Americans and no more likely to have information about terrorism. It is inappropriate to single out individuals for questioning on the basis of ethnic or national origin.

I am very concerned about what steps may be taken next. In World War II, our Nation went down the wrong road when we put in prison camps thousands of Japanese-Americans. We now know that it was wrong to do so. We now know that there was no justification for such an action. But that is how far fear can lead us.

A little later, I hope we will hear from the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] who had personal experience how prejudice coupled with the emotion of a war can victimize an entire ethnic community. We want no repeat of the Japanese-American experience. In times of international hostilities such as we face now, leaders in all branches of Government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial, must protect all citizens from petty fears and prejudices that are so easily stirred up.

Whether or not there are terrorist acts in the United States, we must remain true to our basic freedoms and preserve our civil liberties. If we do not, we allow the terrorists to win.

The Justice Department must be very careful in any efforts to deport Iraqi nationals. It must be careful to avoid cases of mistaken identity and it must be careful not to detain American citizens or permanent resident aliens.

The political views of Arab-Americans should not be the concern of the FBI. The FBI should restrict its efforts to the investigation of criminal acts.

If the FBI has a reasonable suspicion that someone is engaged in criminal acts or is planning criminal acts, then the FBI should investigate. If the FBI has reason to believe that a particular individual may have information about a particular act or planned act of terrorism, then the FBI should question that person.

□ 1250

But civil liberties will suffer if the FBI casts a wide net and interviews people on the basis of their ethnic or religious or national origin or on the basis of their political views or their political activism.

Remember this, if there is one lesson that we have learned the hard way in this country, it is that political dissent is not evidence of an intention to use violence.

Madam Speaker, the Washington Post in this morning's edition had an excellent editorial on this subject, and

I submit that for the RECORD at this time.

The article referred to is as follows:

SINGLING OUT ARAB AMERICANS

The Gulf crisis has raised the threat of terrorism—instigated by Saddam Hussein and directed against American targets both abroad and in this country. Hence, the increased security at federal buildings and airports, and the decision of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to photograph and fingerprint visitors holding Iraqi and Kuwaiti passports. These have been telling signs of a nation assuming a wartime footing. Given the pronouncements out of Baghdad, these countermeasures are inconvenient but necessary security precautions against possible terrorist attacks.

Yet it is exactly at times such as these that the government must take care not to circumscribe the rights and freedoms of its citizens. Regrettably, that may have happened last week during the course of a special Federal Bureau of Investigation program focused on Arab Americans.

FBI agents contacted more than 200 Arab-American business and community leaders across the country, ostensibly to inform them of the bureau's intention to protect them against any backlash from the Persian Gulf crisis. Investigating and prosecuting hate crimes and ethnically motivated violence spawned by Middle East turbulence is a legitimate job of federal law enforcement officials, so that aspect of the bureau's initiative was welcomed to Arab Americans. But FBI agents also used the occasion to gather intelligence about possible terrorist threats. This is where the FBI quickly wore out its welcome.

Organizations representing Arab Americans contend that agents asked citizens about their political beliefs, their attitudes toward the Persian Gulf crisis, Saddam Hussein and their knowledge or suspicions about possible terrorism. Deputy Attorney General William P. Barr denies any FBI intention to intimidate Arab Americans, as some community leaders fear. "At the same time," he says, "in the light of the terrorist threats . . . it is only prudent to solicit information about potential terrorist activity and to request the future assistance of these individuals."

But why does the government presume that Americans of Arab descent should know about "potential terrorist activity" or that this group of Americans is any more knowledgeable about such activity than any other? FBI spokesman Thomas F. Jones says it's because the bureau is aware of a number of terrorist organizations in the United States that "consist of people of Middle East descent" and that the "possibility exists that (terrorists) are living in Arab-American communities." In that way, he said, Arab Americans "could come into possession of information on potential terrorist acts."

It is a perilously flimsy rationale. It leaves the U.S. Government wide open to the accusation that it is dividing Americans by ethnic background and singling out one group as a suspect class. If that were true, the government's conduct would clearly be constitutionally offensive and morally repugnant. To imply that Arab Americans—some of whom are members of families that have been in this country since the turn of the century—may have a special link to terrorists is both insidious and harmful. The government cannot go around making judgments and presumptions about citizens on the basis of their descent.

Like all Americans, Arab Americans have the right to be accepted and treated as individuals, and the government has a constitutional duty to observe and protect that right. Neither should the government invade the privacy or trample the dignity of one class of citizens. What is being seen now recalls the negative stereotyping that served as a basis for the shameful treatment of Americans of Japanese ancestry during World War II. Such stereotyping, with all its ugly and unfair implications, should not be allowed to take hold.

Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure and honor to yield to our colleague, a very distinguished Member who, as a young boy, had a very unpleasant and terrible experience where national hysteria took over the country, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Madam Speaker, Members of Congress care deeply about the American people in this time of crisis for our Nation. We meet here today in a race against time and the tide of events now unfolding in the Middle East.

On Saturday, the House went on record in an important matter related to the conflict between the United States and Iraq.

In this, the House voted overwhelmingly to reassert a key principle of our Constitution: That the President clearly has the obligation to seek the approval of Congress before starting a war.

It is now time to reassert another principle: That armed conflict in the Persian Gulf—if it comes—will not be a license to selectively strip away the civil liberties guaranteed every American by this same Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank our good friend and colleague from San Jose—Congressman DON EDWARDS—for requesting this time today to sound a very real warning.

I am joining him in this because I know first-hand just how strong that warning needs to be.

On December 7, 1941, Japan attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor without warning. I was 10 years old at the time and living in the town in which I was born and raised: San Jose, CA.

When the Japanese Empire attacked Pearl Harbor, they attacked every American—including Americans of Japanese ancestry.

But Americans of Japanese ancestry soon found their civil liberties under attack not from the Empire of Japan, but by the United States Government.

On February 19, 1942, President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066—the first step toward excluding all Americans of Japanese ancestry from the west coast.

No charges were ever filed against us.

Our only crime was that by accident of birth we were of Japanese ancestry.

Madam Speaker, I spent 18 months—including my 11th birthday—in intern-

ment camps in California and Wyoming.

In all, more than 120,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry had their most basic human rights stripped from them, their personal justice denied for no reason other than their ancestry.

Many of those Americans lived behind barbed wire in harsh conditions while their sons and fathers and brothers were fighting the Axis powers. They served this country as military intelligence specialists in the Pacific Theater, and in Europe as part of the 442d Regimental Combat Team—the most decorated military unit in American history.

Our resolve at the end of the Second World War was that the American tragedy we had endured in the internment camps must never happen to anyone ever again.

Such was the apology and promise Congress and President Reagan made to the American people when we enacted The Civil Liberties Act of 1988, which redressed the internment.

But Madam Speaker, today I see the spectre of a challenge to that promise.

Madam Speaker, today many innocent Arab-Americans are worried that their civil rights may be caught up in the maelstrom of war hysteria should a military conflict erupt in the Middle East.

And Madam Speaker, theirs is a legitimate concern.

As early as 1979, when the revolution in Iran toppled the Shah, there was talk in our Nation's Capital about another roundup.

I recall that within a few days of the fall of the American Embassy in Teheran, the Departments of State and Defense and the intelligence agencies briefed Members of Congress about the situation in Iran.

And yes, sadly, I recall that there were then suggestions made that a "roundup" of all Iranian Americans and other fundamentalist Moslems in the United States might be a good idea.

Madam Speaker, at that moment in 1979, I suddenly realized how the seeds had been sown for my internment back in 1942.

Hysteria, racism, and weak political leadership had fed upon themselves.

The result was that the protections of our Constitution were simply set aside for a select and temporarily unpopular group of Americans.

This scenario reared its ugly head again in the 1980's. Arab-Americans were under attack.

Had the Immigration and Naturalization Service had its way, INS would have used its 100-acre prison complex in Oakdale, LA, as a detention center for so-called undesirables.

The "Option Paper," as INS itself described it, was designed to do one thing and one thing only—and in their words—"to locate, apprehend and remove a body of aliens from the U.S."

Why? Because of their ethnicity. Because members of certain ethnic groups held views on issues that were "dangerous."

Madam Speaker, the Constitution of the United States has only one master: The rule of law provided by the consent of the American people.

No one—not the President, not Congress, and certainly not a single Government agency—has the authority to suspend anyone's civil rights without the due process of that law.

Now, Madam Speaker, we have yet another event that is part of the same pattern of policies that put expedience ahead of constitutional safeguards.

It is a pattern where mistaken assumptions about national security have been made and may be implemented without properly protecting the civil rights of individuals.

I refer specifically to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's recent pattern of interviews targeting Americans of Arab ancestry.

I, along with Congressman EDWARDS, have been briefed on this program by the FBI. We requested the briefing after some Arab-Americans in California had experienced a sort of random interrogation that raised the spectre of another tragic violation of civil rights.

Madam Speaker, the internment of Americans of Japanese ancestry during the Second World War was the culmination of a pattern of racism and hysteria. The same pattern may be at work today against Arab-Americans.

Threats of internment in the 1970's, a plan for camps in the 1980's, and now intimidation.

Madam Speaker, there was another time in our history when questions of this sort led to a tragedy of civil liberties.

In the 1950's, the FBI went to loyal Americans and asked questions about who they knew who might be "disloyal." Proving one's loyalty meant giving the names of people who might be suspected of disloyalty.

This was the time of the blacklist. This was the time of McCarthyism.

Now, loyal Arab-Americans are being asked about their views. They are being asked for names.

Rightfully, the duty and charge to the FBI is to fight terrorism.

Americans have a right to travel freely in the United States without the fear of attack.

Americans have a right to assemble in public without fear of being maimed or killed by insane madmen who would sacrifice themselves as human bombs.

Americans have a right to expect that their government will protect them from harm, and the FBI has an excellent record of doing just that—most often without the general public aware of the Bureau's day-to-day successes.

But despite the Bureau's capability and good intentions, the spectre of par-

allels to McCarthyism is too obvious to be ignored.

The United States is a diverse nation composed of a great tapestry of peoples and cultures. It is this tapestry that gives our Nation its strength and resolve to fulfill our ideals of freedom and democracy.

Every American should be alarmed at any threat to civil rights because tomorrow another ethnic group could be the target of suspicion. And another. And another. And another.

Madam Speaker, as much as we all pray against the possibility of a war, a war in the Middle East may soon be fought. Many say that the fight will be about the great principles of freedom, democracy, and human rights.

If this is the case, then I know of no more sacred duty the Members of this chamber have than to protect these very rights here in the United States.

Madman Speaker, if a war does begin in the Middle East, there will be legitimate fears of terrorism here in the United States.

There is today an urgent need for the Justice Department and the FBI to ferret out any and all enemy agents—citizen and noncitizen—who would maim and kill Americans.

But should terrorism hit at home as a result of a war in the Middle East, I fear that there will be calls for wholesale arrests that go beyond probable cause.

I fear there will be calls for internment.

Madam Speaker, when and if that happens, the civil rights of Americans and the rule of law must not be sequestered.

The great Constitution of the United States of America must not be allowed to become a casualty of our conflict with Saddam Hussein.

□ 1300

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS], my dear friend and colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary, for yielding to me, and I thank him for taking this special order to call clear attention to the potential overreaction of our law enforcement agencies as a result of the difficulties which are now being experienced in the Gulf of Persia.

I would like, if I could, certainly to salute the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], my friend, as well, whose personal recital was both quite eloquent, as well as quite informative.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Reclaiming my time just for a second to reemphasize what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] said, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] made a major contribution and a splendid speech. He was the original author

and secured the enactment of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, which is very much to his credit, and I think the advice that he gave us and the advice that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] is giving us is terribly important, and the message should go out now, which did not happen before these other crises.

Madam Speaker, I yield again to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS], and I was going to say that I have had the opportunity of becoming very close personally and professionally to the gentleman from San Jose, CA [Mr. MINETA], both because our offices are in the same wing of the Rayburn Building and we have had the opportunity of walking back and forth many years to the Capitol, and, because our sons are about the same age, we have had a lot of reason to share thoughts and ideas.

It is beautiful that this man, who could have borne a grudge or resentment against this Nation of ours, or against law enforcement people, or against President Roosevelt, did not bear that grudge, but instead, by his loyal service to the Nation in uniform, and by his service as mayor of San Jose and by his distinguished service here in this body for many years has elevated, in the eyes of many people in this country, the talent, and the worthwhileness, and the spirit, and the zeal, and the imagination of Americans of Japanese heritage and Japanese ancestry.

He also has, despite having the difficulties of spending his 11th birthday in internment camp and despite being a little boy in his Boy Scout uniform not really understanding what was going on, come from that to give such great example is itself an example to me and to all of his colleagues, I would say, an certainly because of his personal experience, his admonition, his wise statement, his advice to us today and, by extension, to all this Chamber and this country of the need to be wary, and careful, and circumspect and restrained at this very moment even when war could break out I think is the most apt and appropriate advice anyone can give us. So I join with the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] in support of those statements on this issue and also with respect to the fact that in my hometown there are many people of Arab origin. Many, many people whose origins are from the Middle East; from Lebanon, from Syria, from Iraq, from Saudi Arabia, from Iran, who are the most wonderful people one can imagine, loyal, hard-working, disciplined, productive just simply because they happen to have the accident of being born of Arab descent, in the same way it was my accident to be born an Italian, would cause them to be interrogated, or questioned, or interned, pray

God not, would certainly be not a happy chapter in our national history.

So, I think perhaps with this warning and with the fact the FBI is run by a very diligent judge who is very careful, and by special agents such as ours in Louisville who is a very careful, thoughtful individual, perhaps all of this combined would make sure that there are no excesses and that Americans are protected against the very people, the terrorists, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] has identified, and yet the innocent people among us whose origins are not from places in the world that are now at peace would not suffer the ignominy and would not have the unhappy situation of having to be brought before law enforcement authorities.

So, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], my friend, and look forward to working with him on this issue.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] for his valuable contribution, and, Madam Speaker, the message is out now, and I hope that all of our colleagues pay attention to it and spread the word throughout the country that this time, if there is a war or another kind of a crisis, that we are not going to tolerate the same kind of behavior by government agencies, police agencies, that there was too much of in previous war and previous crises.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KAPTUR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION OF IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness, and yet with equally great, if not greater, conviction, that I introduce today a resolution of impeachment of President Bush. It is known as House Resolution 34, and I will provide this resolution as introduced to be appended at the end of my remarks today.

At a time when our Nation is deeply divided over the question of war, we find ourselves on the brink of a world war of such magnitude that our minds cannot fully comprehend the destruc-

tion that is about to be leveled. The position we are in is a direct result of the actions of one man and the reactions of another. The Iraqi people are as opposed to war as are the American people. The difference is that the Iraqi people have no choice but to support their country's leader, but the American people not only have the right to oppose and speak out in disagreement with the President, but they have the responsibility to do so if our democracy is to be preserved. Today I exercise this constitutional right and responsibility to speak out in opposition to war in the Middle East and in support of removal of our Nation's Chief Executive.

When I took the oath of office earlier this month, as I had numerous times before, I swore to uphold the Constitution. The President's oath was the same, to uphold the Constitution of the United States. We did not pledge an oath of allegiance to the President but to the Constitution, which is the highest law of the land. The Constitution provides for removal of the President when he has committed high crimes and misdemeanors, including violations of the principles of the Constitution. President Bush has violated these principles.

My resolution has five articles of impeachment. First, the President has violated the equal protection clause of the Constitution. Our soldiers in the Middle East are overwhelmingly poor white, black, and Mexican-American or Hispanic-American. They may be volunteers technically, but their voluntarism is based on the coercion of a system that has denied viable opportunities to these classes of our citizens. Under the Constitution, all classes of citizens are guaranteed equal protection, and calling on the poor and the minorities to fight a war for oil to preserve the lifestyles of the wealthy is a denial of the rights of these soldiers.

Let me add that since 1981 we have suffered the Reagan-Bush and now the Bush war against the poor, and to add insult to injury, we now are asking the poor to fight while here, as a result of this fight, even the meager programs that the Congress had seen fit to preserve as a national policy will suffer because the money for those programs will be diverted to the cause of this unnecessary war.

Article II of this resolution states that the President has violated the Constitution, Federal law, and the U.N. Charter by bribing, intimidating, and threatening others, including the members of the U.N. Security Council, to support belligerent acts against Iraq. It is clear that the President paid off members of the U.N. Security Council in return for their votes in support of war against Iraq or to abstain from voting contrariwise. The debt of Egypt was, for example, forgiven—\$7 billion, without congressional approval. That, I

think, casts doubtful validity on that Presidential action. The reason for the cancellation of that debt is so that we can then provide an equally enormous amount of armament for Egypt which it cannot obtain because of the debt outstanding. A \$140 million loan to China was agreed to. The Soviet Union was promised over \$7 billion in aid. This is a sum totally unreported in our country but very well discussed in foreign country presses such as Germany and others. Colombia was promised assistance to its armed forces. Zaire was promised military assistance and partial forgiveness of its debt. Saudi Arabia was promised \$12 billion in arms, and more than that. Actually in October, the President let them have \$2.2 billion, and there was a commitment for \$21 billion more, but because of the outcry in Congress and the Israeli opposition, that is being postponed. But there is still a commitment for \$22 billion. I am sure this month will see the initial efforts to bring about compliance with that commitment.

Yemen was threatened with the termination of support, and the United States finally paid off \$187 million of its debt to the United Nations after the vote President Bush sought was made.

This is all so ironic. When our President ran for the U.S. Senate in the 1960's, he told the people of Texas that if he would be elected to the Senate, he would lead the fight to remove the United States from the United Nations if what he called Red China at that time was admitted. Fate and power almighty have a very, very mysterious way of working together. Who was to believe during that year in that race in Texas that years later this same man, now the President, would be the man the President would appoint to represent us in the United Nations and welcome Red China as a member of the United Nations.

The vote was bought, and it will be paid for with the lives of our poor elements who are going to shoulder the fight.

Article III states that the President has conspired to engage in a massive war against Iraq, employing methods of mass destruction that will result in the killing of tens of thousands of civilians, many of whom will be children. No civilian lives have yet been lost that we know of, but when we start using the weapons of massive destruction that are in place for this war, there is no doubt that thousands of innocent civilians will lose their lives. As killings occur, the principles laid down in the Nuremberg trials will be applicable. Their deaths will not only be a moral outrage, they will constitute violations of international law.

Article IV states that the President has committed the United States to acts of war without congressional consent and contrary to the U.N. Charter and international law. From August

1990 through January 1991 the President embarked on a course of action that systematically eliminated every option for peaceful resolution of the Persian Gulf crisis. Once the President approached Congress for a declaration of war, 500,000 American soldiers lives were in jeopardy, rendering any substantive debate by Congress meaningless. It is also ironic that what we have ended up with now is that the President has exchanged about 200 to 250 so-called hostages, Americans, all of them employees of oil companies in Kuwait or Iraq, and in exchange we now have close to 500,000 American soldiers as hostages. Hostages to the whims, the caprices, and the decisions and judgments made by other leaders, over which this President and our country has no control, all the way from Shamir of Israel to the immigrants in the Saudi sands.

□ 1320

Article 5 states that the President has conspired to commit crimes against the peace by leading the United States into aggressive war against Iraq, in violation of article 24 of the U.N. Charter, the Nuremberg Charter, other international instruments and treaties, and the Constitution of the United States.

Again, there is a violation of law by a President, who, believing and acting as if he is king, decides for the country, unilaterally, that war is the answer.

Madam Speaker, it is a sad day for our country, and it will be an even sadder day once the fighting starts. President Bush must be stopped. A divided Congress reflecting the divided country is no way to conduct a war. The preservation of lives is at stake, and the preservation of our country, indeed, our democracy, is at stake as well.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. All I ask is a hearing, as I have before, before the proper committee of proper jurisdiction, and that is it. I will argue the case there. The rest is up to the Members' judgment.

Madam Speaker, I urge interest and support of this resolution, and to stand up to the President on behalf of the soldiers who will die, the civilians who will be massacred, and the Constitution that will be destroyed if this country goes to war in the Middle East.

WHY AMERICA SHOULD NOT GO TO WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, and gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, during these critical hours, I chose as one Member of this body not to remain silent. The State of Ohio and the district that I represent are patriotic beyond measure. Our people well understand

the meaning of duty. Our Veterans of Foreign Wars, the VFW, has the second largest membership in the United States, even though we are not the second most populous State in the Nation. Ohio's American Legion sends more boys and girls to Boys State and Girls State than any other State in the Union, and we are not the most populous State in the Union.

We are home to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and dozens of other Active Reserve units. In fact, Ohio leads the Nation in the number of Active and Reserve members of our Armed Forces who have enrolled in the GI educational benefits program. Most of our medical and Naval and Army Reserve units have already been called up. Others are on standby.

Mr. Speaker, I say this to illustrate that our citizens have the experience and willingness to serve and fight, but they want to be certain of why.

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. deadline has passed, and America is not yet at war. Not a shot has been fired. No missiles have yet been launched. Not one American has died in combat. A great silence has fallen over America, Mr. Speaker, the silence of 250 million Americans holding their breath.

The U.N. deadline has passed, but a deadline for war is never absolute. We do not have to have a war by stopwatch. If there is an inch of reason in which wisdom can prevail, let us use that inch.

The day after Britain entered World War I, the great writer Henry James wrote these words:

The plunge of civilization into the abyss of blood and darkness * * * is a thing that gives way the whole long age during which we have supposed the world to be, with whatever abatement, gradually bettering, that to have to take it all now for what the treacherous years were all the while really making for and meaning is too tragic for words.

Mr. President, the world has been trying to better itself for several decades by creating a new world order, an order founded on the essential principle that conflict is resolved by negotiation and compromise. Progress has been made, but that new world order is still ever fragile. It can be lost and destroyed if we plunge into the abyss of blood and darkness, whether that abyss is in Lithuania or in the Persian Gulf.

Wars are never stabilizing, and war is the oldest habit of the old way of doing things. Wars are destructive. Wars are violent beyond measure. After the death of thousands of people, the diplomats always wind up where they should have been in the first place, at the conference table.

Wise men and women should never stoop to the level of fools. The American people do not want this war. No war for oil, Mr. President, no war for oil. It is the cry that I am hearing in every city in this country. It is getting louder and louder.

We are in the silence between the thunder and the lightning. For the moment everyone is looking up into the sky to see if the lightning will strike. We have heard the rumble and the thunder of war for 5 months. But this storm can pass by, as we all know, and the lightning can never strike. This storm can pass if nations and their leaders are wise.

The United States is a great and judicious power, and the measure of a great power is not only its army, but its wisdom, its capacity to go ahead, to measure its interest in the long term. Tyrannical aggressors like Saddam Hussein come and go. Brinksmanship in this situation has enlarged him far beyond what he is.

Iraq has 17 million people and its GNP by anyone's measure ranks it as a Third World developing nation.

A great power like the United States should bide its time and use its military power sparingly, if at all. We are a nation of 250 million people with the most powerful military force on the face of the Earth, including nuclear weapons, and a GNP the envy of all other nations in the world.

We have heard during recent days that we must level Iraq because she is another Germany, as Germany was during World War II and before.

Iraq is no Germany. Saddam Hussein is no Hitler. Hussein has been thwarted in his aggressive action during the last decade by nations in his own region.

In World War II, Hitler systematically rolled over the industrialized nations adjoining him. Though Hussein is indeed an aggressor, he has been turned back in his adventures by Israel, then by Iran, and he will be turned back in Kuwait as well. If he is a Hitler, he is certainly much less successful, and Iraq is not an industrial power as Germany was before and during World War II.

Letting the economic noose tighten slowly around Iraq by letting the sanctions work is a much more credible posture for the United States at this juncture because it involves the total support of all of our allies.

□ 1330

War should only be a last resort. The lives of our people and the civilians and others in that region are much too precious.

The Middle East has been a destabilized region of the world for some decades, some would say centuries. War has followed war. It is a region with numerous deep and unsettled issues awaiting resolution. Every war in that region has only begotten another war for the next generation.

At some point the world powers and the United Nations must find new, constructive formula for settling these long-festering and painful disputes. The United States is at the brink of war and finds this region in our vital

interests because of oil. That is the reason, oil. Oil, and our dependency on the Middle East has been increasing despite all caution to the opposite.

Our allies depend on Middle East oil even more than we do. Oil, our oil dependency has been a destabilizing factor for the United States for the last two decades. How will history judge America in years hence for her slumber while foreign oil in greater and greater quantities coursed through her veins?

Ever since the first oil shock of 1973 when the price of oil then was only \$2.50 a barrel, and now it is over \$30 a barrel, Middle East oil has been a destabilizing factor for this Nation, indeed for the world. It pushed us into recession in 1973. I can still remember the gas lines in my district.

It then caused havoc when the price rose again, havoc to our economy in 1978, and now, just a few years later, in 1991, it pushes us to the brink of war.

The first oil shock came in 1973, but we did not heed its warning. The second oil shock came in 1978 and 1979 with the Iranian revolution. Again, we took only half-hearted measures. In 1987 our Navy was sent into the Persian Gulf to protect Kuwaiti tankers that had been reflagged by President Reagan. Now in 1991, we are at the very edge of a violent war. Always, always the reason is oil, the oil of the Middle East.

America saw this crisis coming. Some in America saw this crisis coming and were really willing to look it straight in the eye. This is not news to us. Over 15 years ago, the great U.S. Senator, Frank Church, a magnificent American, held hearings in the Senate on the role of the multinational companies and concluded then, and the RECORD states that if the world failed to set up international institutions capable of resolving Middle East oil-related disputes, and distributing the profits generated fairly, the world was headed for armed conflict.

Then in the late 1970's at the height of the U.S. energy crisis, President Carter warned that the energy challenge was the moral equivalent of war.

Rather than coveting someone else's oil, America must ask what is our proper role in a region where we have systematically seen the collapse of the old order, the oil-rich monarchies that kept the oil flowing from the Middle East for most of this century. Of late we have seen much in that region change.

Recall with me, we have seen the Shah of Iran deposed. I can still remember the scene of where they were putting him on the airplane to take him out of the country. Many in the West were surprised when that happened.

Then, shortly thereafter, we saw the President of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, assassinated in a public ceremony as his own army was coming before him. One

week he had been on the cover of Time magazine as "Man of the Year," and shortly thereafter dead in his own land.

We have witnessed kings in that region overthrown. They were overthrown in Libya, and, in fact, Saddam Hussein overthrew a king. We have seen unrest in Sudan, and certainly in Israel, and we saw for 8 years in the 1980's in the Iran-Iraq war in which over 500,000 of their citizens died, and each of these governments has had to put down uprisings within their own lands because of the pent-up political frustrations of the people in each of these nations.

This is the time of America to recognize that the old order in the Middle East, based on kingdoms, not democracies, is being torn from within by powerful pressures for change, pressures even those nations cannot contain. Before going to war, America must ask how deeply and for how long does the United States intend to police entire Arab politics to preserve the old order and our continuing and growing dependence on that oil. What is America's obligation to bolster the power of monarchies in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and for the Emirate of Kuwait?

America cannot be the sentry at the gate for all of the upheavals that will be forthcoming in that region in the years hence, but we can be a constructive force with our allies to forge a Middle East version of NATO so those nations can resolve their internal disputes themselves.

For two decades, America has not heeded the warnings. For two decades, we have taken half-hearted measures, but no real measures to stabilize the Middle East, and unhook ourselves from Middle East oil. Indeed, over the years our dependency on this unstable source of energy has only increased.

Over half of the oil this Nation uses is imported as we sit here and stand here today, and the amounts are increasing, much of it from that region of the world. Now we must pay the price, a very violent price. Whether we go to war or not today, or tomorrow, or the tomorrow after tomorrow, this Nation must come to grips with this fundamental problem. It is in our most vital interest, for a nation's national economic interest is equal to its national security interest.

But I do not propose that we solve that problem in the Middle East. I propose that we solve the problem right here at home by investment in our own alternative energy sources. So I propose that we use that pause, this period before war, to go back in history and again reread the lessons that we have too long ignored, to begin reminding ourselves of what we did not do, of why we are on this very day at the brink of war.

So I will be here next week to begin this history lesson, and day after day I will be here to read the RECORD, to re-

mind us of the many opportunities we had over the last two decades to unhook ourselves from Middle East oil.

No blood for oil, Mr. President, no blood at all.

A SOLEMN DAY IN THE HISTORY OF OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BATEMAN. Madam Speaker, this is indeed a very solemn day in the history of our country and in the affairs of mankind. Even as I address the House in this special order, it is possible before the course of my remarks is concluded that the forces of war and violence will have been unleashed in the Middle East either by our President and Commander in Chief's decision as authorized by Congress in a strike against the forces of Saddam Hussein in pursuit of our legitimate objectives in the Middle East, or because of a first strike, a preemptive strike that may be initiated by Saddam Hussein against our own forces. What a solemn occasion then this is.

How remarkable it is the diversity of this country as has been perhaps, or will be, demonstrated by the tenor of my remarks and the tenor of those remarks from the able speakers who preceded me. That is indicative of the inherent diversity of this great Nation. Yet, with all of that diversity, and we should not want it otherwise, there must be a cohesion within our Nation if nationhood is to mean anything.

In our country, under our political system, there is a glue that produces, or should produce, cohesion out of diverse opinions, and that cohesion comes from this being a representative democracy.

I, like so many of my colleagues, participated in the debate on the several resolutions late last week culminating in the historic votes that were cast in this body and in the other body on Saturday. There were many diverse points of view expressed, and after the longest debate in the modern history of the House of Representatives, this body did, indeed, vote, and by a margin of 250 to 183, performed the solemn act of giving authority to the President of the United States to utilize forceful means to require, or to bring about, Saddam Hussein's withdrawal from Kuwait. I voted in favor of giving the President that authority. I did so being very, very mindful of the awesome possibilities that it created. I did so with some optimism, however, that if this Congress authorized that use of force that, along with the sanctions which had been biting at Iraq, would convince Saddam Hussein ultimately and before the United Nations deadline that, indeed, he should give up his conquest of Kuwait and withdraw because of the

awesome consequences of not doing so. He, of course, did not do so by the deadline of midnight, January 15.

Not only did he not do so, but his Foreign Minister failed, indeed refused, to even discuss Iraqi aggression against Kuwait when he met with our Secretary of State in Geneva.

Saddam Hussein, in all of the reports of the many meetings that he had held with various representatives of other governments and other figures within recent days, engages in not even a meaningful dialog or discussion about Kuwait or any circumstances under which he will withdraw from Kuwait.

This is a very great country. I am very proud to be an American, and Americans have so many things to be proud of. This country, as a nation and as a people, has contributed more to civilization in the last three generations than any nation or any people in recorded history.

Let me take a moment to remind ourselves of how great and how good this country has been.

We entered World War I in an effort to make the world safe for democracy, to see that the imperialism of the Kaiser would not prevail, and by contributing our blood and our treasury, we were successful in that endeavor. It was an American President, Woodrow Wilson, who became virtually the idol of all the civilized masses throughout the world as he spoke for peace and national self-determination and for a League of Nations that would provide, indeed, a new world order, that would secure the peace through the collective efforts of all of the civilized nations of the world.

We faltered after World War I, and this country elected not to become even a member of the League of Nations. This country chose, instead, to retreat into isolationism and to what has been described as Fortress America. This forced us ultimately to pay a very, very heavy price for, through our nonparticipation and through the disarmament that was rampant in the early 1930's, Western democracies were unprepared and unwilling to take measures necessary to reject and to deter aggression.

The Empire of Japan in 1931 invaded Manchuria, and the world stood by and took no action. In 1935, and I think the analogies to Saddam Hussein and Iraq and Kuwait are more nearly analogous to 1935 when Benito Mussolini's Fascist forces invaded Ethiopia, a helpless and defenseless people in an act of complete, blatant aggression, and in the course of that aggression against people who were armed virtually with no more than sticks and bones and bows and arrows, used poison gas to subjugate them, and the League of Nations met, debated and discussed, but took no action, and another fascist dictator named Adolf Hitler, learning from that example, then moved into the Rhine-

land, and in 1936 effected a forced unity between Germany and Austria. Then still no actions having been taken, Adolf Hitler then insisted upon the annexation of the Sudetenland of Czechoslovakia into the Third Reich.

At Munich in 1938, Western democracies caved in, appeased Adolf Hitler, gave him the Sudetenland based upon his empty and false promise that he would then be satisfied, only to find that within a few months of the annexation of the Sudetenland he moved into and annexed all of the remainder of Czechoslovakia, and so it was not until 1939 when Adolf Hitler, having reached his pact with Josef Stalin, moved into Poland, and not until then did Western democracies determine that they were then and finally forced to fight.

□ 1350

Therefore, World War II began. The United States stood remote from it until ultimately we were attacked at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. Thereafter, this country expended so many lives and so much treasure in winning the war against the Axis power, a war that could have been avoided, a war that should have been avoided. Not having avoided that war and having fought it to a conclusion, this country, under the leadership of then President Franklin Roosevelt became the leader in the effort to create the United Nations as an entity in which the nations of the world could come together in a framework of collective security in order to maintain peace and to deter aggression and to punish it, to reverse it, were it to occur. How remarkable it is that one nation, one people could say that they had saved civilization, twice, in a period of 30 or 40 years. From 1945 and the conclusion of World War II, this country, because of the expansionist designs of the Soviet Union and, indeed, their having expanded a sphere of influence by force into Eastern Europe, was locked in a struggle, most of the times not violent, with communism, and led an alliance of free nations to contain it, in the sure and certain belief that if we did so, over time, the merits of our system, of our ideology, would prefer, and the communism ideology would fall of its own lack of merit. It took a long time. It took a lot of sacrifice. It took a lot of financial resources of the American people, and a lot of dedicated Americans who served their country in uniform, before ultimately in 1989, as predicted and as hoped, communism began to fall of its own weight, its own lack of merit, its inability to feed, to sustain, its people.

The Iron Curtain dissolved. All the countries of Eastern Europe threw off the choke of repressive Communist regimes. The Berlin Wall came down. All because this country and its people had the strength, the resolve, and the wisdom to resist an evil in the world that

would have consumed everyone had we not done so.

What a great tribute to our people, and how much we are entitled to have enjoyed the fruits of their enormous victory. But then, as that victory was won and the cold war presumably was over, Saddam Hussein invaded a weak and powerless Kuwait on August 2. This country responded as all Americans would have wanted this country to respond, by condemning the act of aggression and insisting that it could not stand, and by doing some other things. First, by deploying American forces to the Middle East to try and assure that Saddam Hussein's aggression did not extend further into Saudi Arabia or other countries in the Middle East; and we went to the United Nations, that body that we were most instrumental in creating and for which we have all had the hope that it would provide the vehicle, the instrumentality, for a new world order, where all nations could be secure and at peace. Through our leadership, and at our urging, the U.N. Security Council on 11 occasions prior to November 8, not only condemned Saddam Hussein and his aggression, but insisted that he must get out of Kuwait, unconditionally and without reservation. Sanctions were imposed by the United Nations under the leadership of the United States. Those sanctions remained in effect, and if anything, were tightened during the period from which they were originally instituted until November of last year. However, Saddam Hussein was totally unrelenting and remained totally defiant. Now, there was no argument that sanctions alone, without a credible military threat, would not induce Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait. The character of Saddam Hussein is sufficiently well known. His record is sufficiently clear that it would be naive in the extreme to think that economic sanctions which might inflict hardship upon his people would be sufficient to induce him to give up his conquest. There is nothing in his record, nothing in his history, that suggests that he would waver at the thought of tremendous sacrifice that would befall his people through economic sanctions.

Certainly, it is very clear that the last way that sanctions would have an adverse effect, would be upon his military capability because in that nation of 17 million people he has expended most of their treasury, not to improve the lot of his people but to expand his military capability, to maintain the fourth largest army in the world, to equip it with an enormous array of military hardware, to develop chemical weapons, and biological weapons, and indeed, there is no doubt of his desire and objective of developing nuclear weapons as soon as he is able to do so.

This is the nature of the person that we confront and whose aggression we are pledged to reverse. I as an Amer-

ican am very proud of the fact that our country has taken this position. It is a moral position. It is a noble position. It is a position worth taking for. If the United States and its people are unwilling to stand up and to accept risk on behalf of deterring the aggression against Kuwait, if Saddam Hussein is permitted to have any reward for having engaged in those acts of aggression, then the American people will have lost a resolve that will make the world a much more dangerous and unsafe world for Americans and for all mankind. It is my hope that we have not lost that resolve.

In November, the President, acting upon what I think was certainly a clear consensus internationally that sanctions alone without a credible threat of military force, announced that he was deploying additional American military resources to the Middle East in order that there would be a capability, if required, of using military force to assure that Saddam Hussein withdraw from Kuwait. That deployment of additional forces has been ongoing. Its design of developing a credible threat was perhaps to some extent ambiguous because of those in this country who cried out against the possible use of force, but ultimately this Congress, last Saturday, made that threat of force entirely credible. It was credible because the amount of that force which had been deployed was more than adequate for the mere protection of Saudi Arabia, but hopefully, and I believe adequate for purposes of military action that would require Saddam Hussein to withdraw. But not only was the extent of the force that was there and available a basis for it being a credible threat of force, this Congress, last Saturday, authorized the President of the United States to use that force if necessary.

□ 1400

Even with that, Saddam Hussein has been completely and totally unrelenting.

Now we hear, as we heard throughout the course of the debate last week, some who say that we should not use force, that we should wait and allow sanctions to work.

I would like very much to believe that that was a realistic and sound policy which would bring about our minimum objectives, but unfortunately I do not. I would suggest to those who say that it is that they must look at this not in the context of letting sanctions continue to work and thinking that nothing else in the equation will change, because the Middle East is a very dynamic and indeed an unstable area. Conditions and circumstances will not remain the same over the year, 18 months or more, that you can ever hope that economic sanctions alone would produce the result that the world requires of Saddam Hussein.

Saddam Hussein, while a secular leader throughout his career and since he seized power in Iraq, has begun to preach a rhetoric of Islamic fundamentalism. His role as an Islamic fundamentalist prophet is that I am sure of a false prophet, but nonetheless, that rhetoric has great appeal to the Arab masses throughout the Middle East. It has the capability of destabilizing the Middle East, of producing ferment on the streets of Cairo and places as far removed from the Middle East as Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia.

Heaven only knows how destabilizing it already is in Jordan and for the possible future of King Hussein in that troubled country.

How disquieting it is to read that the ayatollah of Iran speaks in terms of a Jihad, a holy war, to expel the infidels from Saudi Arabia as an appropriate course of action.

How long through the efforts to have sanctions work can we confidently expect that Iran will not permit a flow of Iraqi oil through its facilities where it would be commingled and then Iraqi oil finds its way to world market and Saddam Hussein's hard currency be replenished, to be used to further strengthen his military capabilities.

I want the credible threat of force that is posed against Saddam Hussein to be sufficient to achieve our objectives. I hope and pray that that will be the result that will come about without the President using the force which he has been authorized to use. That awesome decision lies with our President and we should all join in praying for him, for his strength and for his wisdom as we move through this crisis, as he makes these terrible judgments.

I was thinking last night about the President and the awesome responsibility that he bears and there came to my mind from American history a picture of Abraham Lincoln alone in the White House having to make what was for him and for that time the awful decision as to whether or not to send supplies and reinforcements to Fort Sumter and signal that the beginning of the American Civil War was to come, or whether he chose not to do so in order to assure that war could be avoided.

We know the decision that Abraham Lincoln made. We know the incredible amount of blood and sacrifice that went into backing up that decision; for indeed, it was the Civil War which was the bloodiest struggle in the history of this Nation.

This is the kind of a decision that the present President of the United States has to make. I believe he can be relied upon to make that decision wisely. I believe in my heart that this country's objectives, its declared policy with respect to the Middle East, are worthy, and as I used the word earlier, even noble.

It is a part of trying to assure a new world order for now and into the next

generations, a world in which the strong are not allowed with impunity to attack and vanquish the weak, where order and the rule of law are upheld, not defied, where aggressors are repulsed, not rewarded.

If we do not maintain our resolve, if we permit Saddam Hussein to be rewarded for his act of blatant aggression against Kuwait, it will be difficult for the poor people of Kuwait who have been raped and pillaged subject to inordinate tortures and cruelty, it will be something very, very sad and very disheartening for all the people of the world. We will have lost the opportunity to show that the civilized nations of the world are able and willing to join together to deter aggression. I find that noble, not demeaning.

I find that something more than fighting for oil. I am repulsed by the rhetoric that suggests that this conflict is about the price of gasoline at the gas pumps in the United States of America. This war is about a great deal more than that. That is not to ignore the fact that there are very meaningful substantial national security interests of the United States in whether or not more than 50 percent of the world's oil reserves come under the influence, domination, or control of Saddam Hussein. It is a matter of great consequence to this country that Saddam Hussein or others like him not be able to hold the world hostage because of his ability to control the world's energy supply, and while it would be wonderful and great for this country to have adopted a coherent and comprehensive energy policy and should have done so long ago, and I hope we will get about doing so very, very quickly, there is not energy policy that can make any sense at all, that does not suggest nonetheless that 50 percent of those petroleum reserves being in the Middle East is absolutely indefensible to the world's economy.

There are those who say, well, this should not concern the United States of America, that we get only a small percentage of our oil from the Middle East, and that certainly is true. If that is as far as you look, we could indeed get along without it; but I would ask all to bear in mind that if you eliminate that 50 percent of the world's oil reserves from the international market, all those who now get a 100 percent of their oil from the Middle East will be coming and competing against us to get it from where we now obtain it. So the economic shock waves are as much real for us as they are for anyone else.

No, this struggle, this possible conflict, is not about the price of oil, but it is about the viability of the American economy and America's national security. It is about whether or not aggression is rewarded or repulsed, noble purposes, going far beyond what is the price of oil at American gas pumps.

There are those who say we should not be engaged in any struggle in the Middle East because we have a disproportionate amount of the burden to be carried, that our allies, the members of this remarkable coalition that our President has put together, are not doing as much as they should. I have no quarrel with those who think that the Germans as a nation and as a people could be doing more than they have, and I am even more in agreement that the Japanese have not in any sense come up with their fair share of the financial responsibility for this crisis in the Persian Gulf.

□ 1410

And I would like to see our President and our Secretary of State less distracted in order that they could pursue as part of our diplomatic objectives getting that greater support from the Germans and the Japanese, and I believe it would be forthcoming.

But we should be mindful that this is a remarkable alliance that has been put together, that there are 24 countries that are participating in some form or another, in one degree or another, in the military forces that are in the Middle East on the ground, and 19 countries with naval resources deployed in the Middle East as part of the United Nations and our country's policies and objectives.

That is not inconsiderable.

There goes through my mind recollections when I was in my early teens of 1940 and 1941, before the attack on Pearl Harbor and Great Britain stood alone against Nazi Germany. Nazi Germany had already conquered and occupied, early on, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Poland, France, Denmark, Norway. Yet England stood alone.

Would it have been unseemly, do you think, for Winston Churchill to have said, "Our friends and allies are not supporting us enough, we are in this all by ourselves"?

Would that have been something that would have put Winston Churchill down in the annals of history as one of the great leaders of our time? I think not.

So I think it perhaps not entirely appropriate that if our cause and if our policy, if our objectives are proper and noble, that we should hold back from doing that which our duty summons us to do while we quibble over whether we have as much support from other countries as we think we ought to have.

I do not believe that attitude is characteristic of what made America great or what made it possible for America to save the civilized world in the cause of freedom three times in three generations.

No, I do not think that is the case.

There are many reasons, of course, for not doing one's duty; there are many reasons involving pain and sacrifice. But the American people, I hope,

will be equal to the degree of pain and sacrifice that is required if our cause is just, if our objectives are proper.

I represent a district, the First Congressional District of Virginia, which I am prone, immodestly, to describe as America's first congressional district.

Like all Members of Congress, I am inordinately proud of that district. My district happens to be the site of Jamestown, the first permanent English settlement in the New World. It is the site of Williamsburg, the intellectual capital of the American Revolution, where Washington and Jefferson and Henry and Lee and Wythe helped produce the great documents of freedom.

It also is the site of the Battle of Yorktown, where with our French allies and with the Marquis de Lafayette and Rochambeau, American and French forces defeated the British Army and brought about the surrender of Cornwallis and victory in our Revolution.

It is, of course, the birthplace of George Washington and the birthplace of James Madison.

So for those and many other reasons that I could say, I do refer to my district as America's first district.

In the context in which I am speaking today I can also speak of it perhaps as being America's first district in that there are probably more of my constituents, friends and neighbors who are deployed in the Middle East in the defense of our freedom and security than from any other district in America.

There are more than 40,000 of my friends and neighbors who are there. I care about them and their safety greatly, as does every Member of the Congress, however they voted or whatever position they have taken in this great debate on the Persian Gulf crisis.

I do indeed care about them very, very deeply, and I do not want them in harm's way.

But in addition to caring about them, I am extremely proud of them.

Madam Speaker, I went to Saudi Arabia in December and visited our young people wearing our country's uniform in the deserts of Saudi Arabia.

The American people have every reason to be incredibly proud of those young Americans. Every one of them there are volunteers, and I hope we will remember that they are there because they volunteered to serve their country in uniform. They are not only volunteers, but they are volunteers who, when they entered the Armed Services, ranked in the highest percentile in the aptitude tests that are taken before you enter the Armed Service.

Ninety percent or more of all of those volunteers are at least high school graduates. We have never deployed a force on behalf of the United States that was a more able, more dedicated, certainly no better trained force than

those who serve our country in the Middle East and elsewhere throughout the world in our armed services.

They are truly magnificent and very prepared to do their duty.

One of the aspects of the discussion of the Persian Gulf which has been particularly disquieting to me and I guess I am sensitive to it particularly since I am the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation of our Committee on Armed Services, and that is the discussion about disparity of those serving in the military and who would be subject to taking casualties in the event there was a conflict.

Somehow, discussing these wonderful people who are volunteers in the context of classes within our society is obnoxious to me. There is no American wearing this country's uniform in the Middle East who is a second-class citizen or who comes from the lower classes. They are all Americans. They are all volunteers. If you have got to deal in terms of class, the only classification I am willing to accept is that they are first class.

If there are Americans who are elite, they are the elite Americans.

I would hope that this discussion about these remarkable volunteers who serve this country so well and who are prepared to make any sacrifice in terms of class structure would terminate.

I am not offended one iota if there are a disproportionate number of American young people who are minorities or of minority groups who have seen an opportunity to further themselves, to obtain an education while at the same time serving their country. I find it difficult to object to that. I do not know the social policy that says that is a wrong or that is an evil, that people who have had disadvantages in life should not be encouraged to find advantages and opportunities for themselves through volunteer service to their country.

□ 1420

How people can turn that around and twist it into being some antisocial or improper circumstance is beyond my ability to understand or to appreciate.

With respect to those forces that we have deployed in the Middle East and with respect to this country's military capability and whether or not the American people have gotten anything like their money's worth from the billions, even trillions, of their dollars that we have expended for our national defense, I think some observations are in order.

No country in the history of the world has ever deployed so many people and so much armament in so rapid a period of time as the United States has been able to deploy to the Middle East since August 2. When we talk about the contributions our allies have

made and are making, I think we have to bear in mind that we certainly have the overwhelming preponderance of capability.

The Egyptians have no capability to move hundreds of thousands of forces from Egypt to Saudi Arabia or elsewhere. They do not have what it takes in order to make those kinds of deployments. They do not have the resources to arm all of their forces, as we have been able to arm ours. That is true of most all of the allied nations who have forces in the Persian Gulf.

So, inevitably we have more there because we are much more able to get it there and to sustain it there in the field.

To go to Saudi Arabia, to meet these young people, to see the way that they have been married up with their equipment and put in position, ready to defend themselves, and, if it cannot be avoided, to fight, is a very heartening experience which Americans should be very gratified that we do indeed have that capability and that America and its freedom and security is much the better because we have it.

I spoke earlier about the diversity of this country and how that is so much a part of our national life, and I hope that it ever will be so, but I also spoke of the need for our Nation at a time of crisis to be cohesive, and that cohesiveness that binds us together and makes this Nation able to function for these people of the United States of America to be a nation is representative government.

We have a President who was elected by a majority of the people in 49 of the States of the United States of America. Certainly he has a mandate and certainly is the overwhelming choice of Americans as to who should lead them as their President and to exercise the powers of Commander in Chief.

We have here in the House of Representatives a body elected from 435 elective districts, and we have come together and debated and discussed these awful issues and have resolved by our vote to authorize the President to use military force, having thoroughly and completely aired what are our objectives, what are the policies that took us to the Middle East and what our objectives must be before we are able to leave it. The Senate of the United States, the other body, has similarly voted in favor of giving that authority.

Now is the time for representative government to produce that cohesion throughout America, that America is entitled to expect of its citizens of this country. Let us pray that there will be no necessity for military action, neither today, nor tomorrow, next week or next month. But if the time comes when that awful decision has to be made, the time will also have come for representative government to demonstrate that it is indeed alive and well in the United States of America and

that American citizens, when the due process of law and representative government have run their course, will come together as a people, united in pursuit of those goals, those objectives and those policies that representative democracy have given to us.

Madam Speaker, that may entail pain, it may entail sacrifice, but if Americans are no longer willing to make a sacrifice, if we have become so self-indulgent that a price is no longer willing to be paid, then America will undoubtedly be on a decline, and it will be a precipitous one.

We are the only surviving superpower in the world. It is a role that we are not entirely comfortable with; I know I am not. But there are responsibilities that fall upon the American people today, as they fell upon the American people in 1941 and in 1917, and it will happen again. It is a part of the fact that God has enormously blessed this country and its people that we must bear burdens, we must be willing to accept risks, and we must be willing from time to time to make sacrifices.

I feel that we are in one of those critical junctures in our history where America must determine that it is still willing to make sacrifices on behalf of the policies and objectives that a democratic representative system has laid out for us. That has been done.

The Speaker of this House and the majority leader of this House in the course of Saturday's debate, and even though each of them voted in opposition to the resolution to authorize the President at this time to utilize force, called upon all Americans to support the President of the United States in the awesome decision that he was called upon to make whether or not they favored giving the President the authority to make that decision. I know not whether the President has fully and totally made a decision to use military means in the Middle East to make sure that the people of Kuwait are freed. If he has, he is entitled to expect the support of the American people because the American people, speaking through their elected Representatives, have made these policy choices, have laid out these objectives and have determined the course that we should take. The President can be a great leader of our time only if he has great people who are willing to accept leadership in the context of our free representative form of government.

Let us please come together. Let us be united in our objectives. It is the greatest assurance of peace now, certainly the greatest assurance for peace later, for we will either achieve those noble objectives about which I have talked for so long in this special order, we will achieve them now, or we either lose them or have to sacrifice much more in the future to achieve our minimum objectives than we would have to sacrifice if we stand up to our duties

and to our responsibilities in the present.

□ 1430

Madam Speaker, we owe this to our future. We owe this to our children and our grandchildren.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. MOLINARI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEACH, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MAZZOLI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE, for 5 minutes, on January 17.

Mr. EDWARDS of California, for 30 minutes, on January 17.

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, for 60 minutes, on January 17.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. MOLINARI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BALLENGER in two instances.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. LEACH.

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. BEREUTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONIOR in two instances.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BATEMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 17, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

341. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of January 1, 1991, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 102-4); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

342. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-334, "American Chemical Society, Inc. Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

343. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-335, "House of Mercy Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

344. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-333, "Takoma Park Baptist Church Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

345. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-342, "Acquisition of Space Needs For District Government Officers and Employees Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

346. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-326, "Alternative Fuels Technology Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

347. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-323, "Redistricting Procedure Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

348. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations—Education Department general administrative regulations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

349. A letter from the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting an evaluation of the feasibility of splitting Amtrak's existing California Zephyr/Desert Wind/Pioneer train into two separate trains, pursuant to Public Law 101-322, section 6 (104 Stat. 296); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

350. A letter from the Department of State, transmitting copies of Presidential Determination 91-14, and justification thereto, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

351. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

352. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

353. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the semiannual report

of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

354. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

355. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

356. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

357. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the semiannual report of the Department's inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

358. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

359. A letter from the cochairman, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

360. A letter from the Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting a copy of the annual report of the agency's compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

361. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

362. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

363. A letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

364. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

365. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

366. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

367. A letter from the Public Printer, Government Printing Office, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general,

pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3903 (102 Stat. 2531); to the Committee on Government Operations.

368. A letter from the Acting Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

369. A letter from the Executive Director, Japan-United States Friendship Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

370. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting the review of the administrative procedures of the National Capital Planning Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

371. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

372. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

373. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

374. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

375. A letter from the Chairman, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

376. A letter from the Chairman, National Science Board, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

377. A letter from the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 32 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

378. A letter from the Chairman, Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

379. A letter from the Chairman, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

380. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

381. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general, pursuant to

Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

382. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (96 Stat. 750, 102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

383. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526, 2640); to the Committee on Government Operations.

384. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

385. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

386. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

387. A letter from the U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

388. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 99-399, section 412(a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

389. A letter from the Special Counsel, U.S. Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

390. A letter from the Director, U.S. Trade and Development Program, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

391. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

392. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

393. A letter from the Department of Energy, transmitting a report on steel initiative management plan research and development activities, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 5107; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

394. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting the report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for the period October 1989 through September 1990, and fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 639(d); to the Committee on Small Business.

395. A letter from the Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting

the 14th annual report on the Child Support Enforcement Program for the period ending September 30, 1989, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 652(a)(10); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

396. A letter from the Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report on Senior Executive Service positions in the Department of Housing and Urban Development; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Post Office and Civil Service.

397. A letter from the Executive Director, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting status report for the months of November and December, 1990; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Appropriations.

398. A letter from the Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's fifth biennial report on implementation of the Alaska Federal-Civilian Energy Efficiency Swap Act of 1980, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 795d(a); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

399. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the rehabilitation needs of each Forest Service region, resulting from disastrous forest fire damage during the previous year, pursuant to Public Law 101-286, section 202(1) (104 Stat. 174); jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

400. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a copy of the program opportunity notice [PON] for the fourth round of the Clean Coal Technology [CCT] Demonstration Program; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations; Energy and Commerce; and Science, Space, and Technology.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 536. A bill to extend State jurisdiction over submerged lands and to allow States to grant mineral leases in the extended area; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Judiciary, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. DOWNEY):

H.R. 537. A bill to exempt certain members of the Armed Forces from duty assignments that require the separation of the members from the minor children of the members: to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the exclusion from the unrelated business income tax of revenue received by 501(c) organizations that conduct amateur athletic events; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 539. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prevent the unreasonable detention of certain aliens with dependent children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 540. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, relating to open containers of alcoholic beverages and consumption of alcoholic beverages in the passenger area of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GRADISON:

H.R. 541. A bill relating to the suspension of duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTEL:

H.R. 542. A bill to prohibit foreign interests from owning concessions in units of the National Park System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEVINE of California (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 543. A bill to establish the Manzanar National Historic Site in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H.R. 544. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to restore food supplement benefits under the dependent care food program to adolescent youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 545. A bill to amend the Domestic Volunteer Service Act to provide assistance to projects which utilize volunteers to protect students and employees of educational institutions from violence and criminal activity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 546. A bill to require that the Librarian of Congress appointed from among individuals with specialized training or significant experience in the field of library and information science; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 547. A bill to require the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to treat all deposits at the Freedom National Bank of New York at the time such bank closed as insured deposits; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 548. A bill to provide a schedule for the implementation of the requirement that all eligible Federal prisoners desiring to participate in drug treatment programs be given

such treatment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 549. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide increased penalties for workplace endangerment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. WILSON):

H.R. 550. A bill to protect the cable consumer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STOKES:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Defense should revise restrictions on press coverage of military operations undertaken in the Persian Gulf region to limit such restrictions to those required for operational security and protection of classified information; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H. Res. 34. Resolution impeaching George Herbert Walker Bush, President of the United States, of high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAXON (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. ARMEY):

H. Res. 35. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Margaret Thatcher; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. BAKER, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 257: Mr. BARRETT.

H.R. 321: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 325: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MACHTELEY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 482: Mr. TORRES, Mr. MINETA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LENT, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. KAPUR, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAWELL, and Ms. PELOSI.

H. Res. 33: Mr. HOBSON.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

15. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Boston, MA, office of the mayor, relative to the urban summit; which was referred, jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Ways and Means, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Government Operations.

SENATE—Wednesday, January 16, 1991

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1991)

The Senate met at 12 noon on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? the Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?—Psalm 27:1.

Gracious Father in Heaven, whose wisdom and power and love are without measure, help us to hear these words of the Psalmist in this day of suspense. Thou knowest, Lord, how difficult it is to wait under the best of circumstances. But we wait—the whole Earth waits—hoping still for some last-moment, peaceful solution to the Middle East crisis. Thou dost understand our fear, our apprehension, our strong wish for a last-minute alternative to the threat of war. History is in Your hands. We are in Your hands. Thou knowest our longings, our desperate desires. We turn to Thee, O Lord. We have no place else to go. Work Your will, in spite of us if necessary.

In the name of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 16, 1991.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of Rule I, Section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LEAHY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order, the distinguished majority leader is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the time for the two leaders, there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I reserve all of my leader time, and I reserve all of the leader time of the distinguished Republican leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. FORD pertaining to the introduction of S. 220 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized.

THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, today brings us to a time in our history when the attention of the world and those of all our citizens is riveted, as it should be, on the Middle East, on the desert sands of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the Iraqi crisis. We all hope and pray that our young men and women may be spared the ravages of war regardless of how remote that possibility is. It still is a possibility until the first shot is fired. We recognize that this is a dangerous time and it is one filled with a deep foreboding that so many of us feel.

While the eyes of the world are riveted on that situation and all Ameri-

cans and the coverage attendant with it, it seems to this Senator that what is taking place in another area of the world that may be in the long run of greater consequence to this Nation and to mankind and to the world almost goes unnoticed. Certainly, the gravity of what the Soviets and Mikhail Gorbachev are now undertaking is not receiving the attention that it otherwise would. I speak about the suppression of the people of the Baltics.

Mr. President, on April 25 last year, I warned my colleagues on this Senate floor that Gorbysmania was sweeping across our Nation, and I counseled that we should await action, not words, to determine the real Soviet agenda. That action has now been taken. It is chilling, cold, and it is the cold-blooded murder of those who stand for freedom and democracy.

We cannot remain silent in the face of these actions. I will cosponsor resolutions and bills which will impose sanctions against the Soviets for their actions. I have already called on President Bush to postpone the upcoming summit.

But these worthy actions are not enough. At this crossroad, we are morally compelled to speak with a clear voice to the Soviets. I am introducing a resolution calling on our President to grant full diplomatic recognition to the democratically elected governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Only by granting diplomatic recognition to the embattled Baltic republics can we send the message that must be sent.

It is time to raise our voices for freedom. It is time to cast our lot not with those who seek to extinguish the fire of freedom, but with those who are willing to die for it.

Lithuania, and signs that further action will be taken against not only Lithuania, but Estonia and Latvia as well.

This is not just a pothole on the road to freedom—it is a detour back to the repressive, Stalinist tactics that led to 40 years of cold war confrontations.

Fourteen Lithuanians are dead, shot or steamrolled by Soviet tanks. Many more will die unless they renounce freedom. It is no longer a question of tactics in dealing with the Soviet Union, it is a question of fundamental principles.

What we are seeing in Lithuania today is an old Soviet ploy repeated once again, because on October 29, 1956, the Suez Canal erupted and the atten-

tion of the world was riveted. Four days after that the Soviet tanks rolled into Hungary to kill those fighting for freedom. Now, with the world distracted by the events in the Persian Gulf, Gorbachev has shown his true colors.

Mr. President, this is not some general who is doing this or someone behind the KGB. This is Mikhail Gorbachev who is talking about the suspension of the freedom of the press, which is the underpinning of glasnost. It is indicated that he may ask the Supreme Soviet to suspend freedom of the press.

I think it is about time that we made a clear and unequivocal statement to Mr. Gorbachev that he will not receive the benefits of a nation that talks about freedom, that talks about democracy, that talks about perestroika and glasnost but suppresses his people, but uses this as a window dressing to achieve its own purposes, finance aid, credits, normalization of relationships.

Mr. President, I will be offering a resolution, which I will not offer at this time because I will look to get others to cosponsor it, that says clearly and unequivocally that our President should grant full diplomatic recognition to the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and, by that, I mean full democratic recognition. To say that we really have never really recognized that these people and these nations are independent of the people of the Soviets is one thing, but to implement democracy, to stand up for democracy, to stand for the people who are being mowed down, that is another.

We have an opportunity now to make it clear, and I am not calling for the breaking of diplomatic relations with the Soviets. What I am saying is, do we have the courage to grant full diplomatic recognition to the people of the Baltics? Why should we not?

Mr. President, it seems to me if we continue to practice the policy of political expedience in dealing with countries throughout the world, that we will sow the seeds that bring us to the crisis that we face today because you see it was eight words that brought and sowed the seeds of dissension, allowed people to think they could do what they wanted, swallow up their neighbors, oppress peoples' rights, use chemicals in the killing of not only their own people but others that they come into conflict with. That, I believe, has created the situation which has resulted in a half million of our young men and women being in the Saudi desert today. That is the politics of political expedience. Those eight words are: "The enemy of my enemy is my friend."

Did we not practice that as it related to the Iraqis? Because, after all, they hated, they fought, and they were the menace of Ayatollah Khomeini and the Iranians. It was easy for us to look the other way. Then when Mikhail Gorbachev

brought down the economic barriers and the sanctions—and he employed them ruthlessly a year ago against the Lithuanian people—the politics of political expedience once again reared its head and, after all, if the Soviets were our allies, if they were our friends after we had so much to work with and for, what did it mean that 3 million people were being suppressed? So we were quiet. Oh, yes, we passed some resolutions urging Mikhail Gorbachev to use restraint, but did we really stand for the people and send the right signals?

So today, a year later, we see the tanks, we see the forces of democracy being swept out, we see people being killed, we see television stations being driven off the air, and we see the suppression of free speech. We see the return of Stalinism. We see that Gorbachymania was something that we wanted to believe but the reality of it was not backed up by deeds.

Mr. President, I hope that this administration, notwithstanding the incredible burdens placed upon it and the fact that we have a half-million young men and women in the Middle East, does not preclude us from doing what we should; that is, to give recognition to the legitimacy of the rights of the people of the Baltics, the rights of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Do not take the political, expedient way. Do not be quiet. Do not pass mumbo-jumbo resolutions that mean little, if anything, and that translated into the practical day-to-day world that we live in will not deter the Soviets from making once again a fatal mistake and fatal error in saying that the world will be quiet and acquiesce. Do not, by our silence, plunge us into what then will inevitably be a return of the cold war.

Stand now. Recognize these nations, recognize their rights, and we have an opportunity to send the signal to the Soviets that may dissuade them from otherwise a course of action which I am certain will result in the total repression of these people.

Have we not learned by our past inadequacies, by being quiet as it related to addressing these situations when we have an opportunity, when we should have stood? Now is the time to stand up.

There are those who will say, "Will that create a problem in the Middle East? Will that change the Soviet attitude?"

Well, I do not believe that it will. At this point in time, I think it is important for us to stand for what is morally right, to do the right thing because it is the right thing to do, and to stand for those principles that we talked about and, yet, so many times turned our backs away from.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 1:15 P.M.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, on behalf of the leadership, I ask unanimous consent that we now stand in recess until the hour of 1:15 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 1:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. LIEBERMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Connecticut, suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REID). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OIL COMPANY PROFITEERING

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, the attention of all Americans is naturally focused today on the Persian Gulf. The mood of the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States is somber and tense. We are all praying, naturally, that peace may yet be possible, and of course we are praying particularly for our troops, the men and women in American uniform in the Persian Gulf, should hostilities occur.

But while Americans prepare themselves for the toll of war, we hear reports that American oil companies are preparing themselves for the profit potential of war.

Mr. President, look at this headline from today's Wall Street Journal: "Pump Prices Look Ready for a Run Uphill."

I rise today to issue this warning to the oil companies. There is a worldwide glut of oil. That is a fact. There was a commitment by the International Energy Agency last week to tap into global oil reserves—which run to the hundreds of millions of barrels—if necessary, if war breaks out. To the oil companies I will say this: If you dare to seek unfair profit under cover of war, the American people will demand that Congress act swiftly and strongly in response to your profiteering.

One Texas oil industry spokesman said about the price of gas, "it will definitely go up." Some independent

refiners have already boosted wholesale gasoline prices 15 to 20 cents a gallon just in anticipation of the possibility of military conflict. Yet there are hundreds of millions of barrels of oil in inventories, and approximately 100 million barrels in storage unsold in tankers at sea. That does not even count the hundreds of millions of additional barrels of oil that are today in strategic petroleum reserves in our country and in allied countries.

Absent panic or profiteering, there is absolutely no reason for gas, oil, or propane prices to rise immediately even if war breaks out. Some cite the threat to Saudi oil fields or refineries as an excuse for higher prices. But unless and until real damage occurs, dramatic price increases are simply not justified. Most experts, in fact, believe that the Saudi oil facilities are very well protected. Any immediate gas price increase, any immediate increase in the price of home heating oil or propane, that occurs if a war breaks out is profiteering, pure and simple.

Last year, Mr. President, I introduced an antiprofitteering bill, along with my colleague from Nevada, Senator BRYAN, who is with me on the floor today. That bill was aimed at halting oil profiteering during times of emergency by making it illegal. I also cosponsored a windfall profits tax amendment to the budget agreement. In the last session we were not successful in either of these measures. It is true that they were introduced late in the session.

But we are now receiving predictions that oil companies will report profits for the fourth quarter of 1990 that I have to describe as infuriating and astonishing. Six major oil companies are expected to reap \$6 billion in profits. That is not gross revenues, but \$6 billion in profit just for the last 3 months of 1990. That is a \$2.3 billion increase over the same period just a year before. One analyst projects that Exxon will have a profit of \$1.7 billion for the last 3 months of 1990, which is a 300-percent increase over the fourth quarter of 1989. Even an executive of an oil company reportedly called that profit margin obscene.

The news of record profits, if combined with wartime profiteering, would in my view impel Congress to push legislation—and pass it—that prohibits companies from taking unfair advantage of consumers at a time of national crisis.

While our young men and women are putting their lives on the line to protect America's security and the principles of international law and order, we simply cannot countenance oil companies threatening the stability of our economy at home. We cannot countenance any exhibition of greed at a time of national crisis.

I call on the oil industry—from the boardrooms of big oil to the service

station owners down the block—to show restraint, to support America in our time of need. Profiteering in time of war is un-American, pure and simple. There is no excuse for it whatsoever. Any company that takes advantage of military hostilities in the Persian Gulf to profiteer will receive and deserve the contempt of American people.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague and friend from Nevada, Senator BRYAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the Chair.

PROFITEERING AND THE PERSIAN GULF

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I associate myself with the comments of the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut. I commend him for his leadership on this issue, not only in calling this to our attention today but during the past year with several pieces of legislation to which he alluded, and also in testimony before my subcommittee on a matter that was discussed that bears in point just a matter of 3 or 4 days after the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq.

As the distinguished junior Senator points out, the eyes of the American public are riveted to the Middle East. Americans are watching their television sets round the clock, anxiously pondering, if we are going to be in a war, how soon that will occur, and contemplating all of the devastating consequences personally and otherwise that follow in the wake of that kind of an awesome decision.

I rise as a Member of this Chamber who supported the President in the resolution that was debated before Congress this past week. It is an awesome decision that the President must make, and I must say that if there is any solace or comfort that he may find in this very difficult time it is, although there is division as to policy, I think all of us in this Chamber and across the country stand in support of the fighting men and women in the Persian Gulf.

There is, as my colleague has just pointed out, one sector of the economy that because of its history of indifference to the country's concerns at large should be served notice, and that is the oil industry. The oil industry should understand that Congress and the American people will not tolerate unconscionable increases in the price of gasoline at a time when oil stockpiles are plentiful.

One can only look back a couple of years ago when the *Exxon Valdez* hit the reef off Prince William Sound, a time in which gasoline supplies were plentiful, and no sooner had that news been messaged to the world than immediately big oil seized upon this as an

opportunity to begin a massive runup of the price of gasoline.

More recently, last August, the tanks had hardly rolled across the Kuwaiti border when, indeed, we were hearing almost as soon as the news of that tragic event was announced to the world that the oil companies were taking advantage of that opportunity and running up the prices in a massive and unjustified amount, at a time when our stockpiles were at record levels both in terms of the strategic petroleum reserves and the reserves that were on hand in the private sector. No justification.

In the aftermath of that action, the committee which I chair, the Consumer Subcommittee, held a hearing. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut was our leadoff witness at that hearing. Through what I would characterize as a very convoluted reasoning process the oil companies sought to assure us that they were indeed, not taking advantage of a national emergency; that, for reasons which were unpersuasive and unsatisfactory, I daresay to all of us who serve on the committee today, things occurred which could not be prevented. We were assured at that time that the big oil companies would act responsibly.

I must say that the evidence subsequent to the hearing is otherwise. Indeed, the history of this industry is shameful in terms of its lack of corporate responsibility. This is a history of which any industry and any good corporate citizen would be ashamed. It is as if national disaster and peril is a license to raid the public. Even President Bush, who traces with some pride his own roots to Houston, TX, has twice warned the oil industry that he will not tolerate profiteering.

As my colleague has just pointed out, the Wall Street Journal today has some very troublesome news.

The oil companies are expected soon to post massive fourth quarter profits. This is a litany of profiteering on a massive scale. British Petroleum, Mobil Corp., Royal Dutch Shell, Exxon, Chevron, and Texaco profits—these are the words of the Wall Street Journal—"surged 62 percent."

Earnings of large domestic oil companies jumped 70 percent to \$1.7 billion. That is up by some \$700 million. Chevron's operating profit tripled. Mobil's profit showed a 25-percent increase in profit. Texaco showed a 42-percent increase, and Exxon will show a threefold profit of \$1.7 billion, up from less than a half billion dollars this conglomerate earned in the same corresponding period of a year earlier.

One oil company's public relations executive commented "I understand Exxon's profits are obscene. It scares me."

Mr. President, it not only scares but these kinds of reports also enrage the public. These are very difficult times,

difficult times for American citizens, difficult times for American industry. The economy is sliding into a recession, anxieties increase as the prospect of war appears imminent, and the loss of many young Americans as a consequence of that.

This is terrific news? Terrific for whom? As another oil company executive pointed out. It is certainly not terrific for the American public.

Profits jumping billions, up as high as 70 percent, may be terrific for big oil, but they are unmitigated disaster for virtually every citizen in this country. Oil prices have hurt the consumer. They have fueled inflation, and they have brought a weakened airline industry virtually to its knees with a number of weaker companies filing under the bankruptcy laws for protection.

If these profits do not constitute profiteering, the word has no meaning and should be struck from every dictionary. This is profiteering on a massive scale.

While our President wrestles with war and peace, while the public girds itself for the tragedy and loss of armed conflict, the oil companies are exploiting the American public.

Now as we sit at the brink of conflict, we are told that there is an ample supply of oil, that barring serious damage to the Saudi oil facilities, there will be no supply shortage.

Should the public, should the consumer, take any solace from these undisputed facts? Unfortunately, history's answer is based upon the performance of the oil companies. This simply provides them another opportunity to price gouge the American public. In short, the oil companies will use a war that no one wants as an excuse to go on a raiding expedition on their own, and their target is our wallets.

I will be working with Chairman HOLLINGS and others to hold a hearing shortly on the oil industry, their large profits, and their conduct, in the near future. There will be no respite from the drumbeat of criticism if big oil companies use this conflict to once again continue to plunder the public.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I note that no one else seeks recognition and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Is there a limit of 10 minutes at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the order that is now before the Senate.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I imagine I will require a little more than 10 minutes to make my complete statement. If no one else is asking the floor, I will ask unanimous consent for more time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

S. 221—MILITARY PERSONNEL SAVINGS PLAN

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, on January 14, I was back in my home State of Ohio, and in my absence and at my request, the majority leader, GEORGE MITCHELL, introduced four bills on behalf of myself and Senator MCCAIN concerning benefits for our military personnel deployed on Operation Desert Shield in the Persian Gulf. Today I want to reiterate in person here on the floor my feelings about these bills and my statement accompanying those four bills, and introduce a fifth bill on a savings plan for military personnel in Desert Shield.

Mr. President, on January 14, I elected not to introduce the savings plan bill, because I had received information that day that DOD decided to use its discretionary authority under the fiscal year 1991 Defense Authorization Act to implement the plan. That information turned out to be incorrect; consequently, I am introducing that bill today.

Mr. President, late last year I introduced legislation to provide certain benefits for military personnel deployed to the Persian Gulf in Operation Desert Shield. I took this action because it was obvious to me, after returning from a trip to Saudi Arabia, that there were certain compensation and benefit authorities needed for our military personnel. That trip was in late August and the first few days of September 1990.

I am gratified to note that most of the benefits I proposed, after coming back from that trip, and after talking to the troops and officers over there, were enacted last year in the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991.

Among the provisions enacted were, first, the authority for free mailing for our troops in the Persian Gulf. I add to that, it was a little bit hard to believe I was over there visiting the people in the desert up on the sand dunes, and they had to go find a stamp and try to send a letter back home. We came back and were able to put legislation in.

The Defense Department had authority to act on a wide range of benefits; some they did not, but mostly they did and acted on them. That was one I put in at that time—the authority for free mailing for our troops in the Persian Gulf.

Another was the authority for the retroactive payment of imminent dan-

ger pay, \$110 per month, to the start of Operation Desert Shield in August for military personnel deployed in the Persian Gulf. Also, the Senate provided authority to pay reservists, National Guardsmen and retirees activated for Operation Desert Shield for unused accrued leave when they are deactivated. Also, the legislation included authority to pay activated reserve and National Guard medical personnel the same medical specialty pay authorized for active component personnel—the authority for the payment to activated reserve and National Guard personnel, the same variable housing allowance, VHA, as it is known, that is authorized for active component personnel; and finally, the authority for implementation of a savings plan that would allow military personnel deployed in the Persian Gulf to invest their pay in the U.S. Treasury at an interest rate not to exceed 10 percent per year.

Mr. President, with the exception of the savings plan provision, all of these provisions have now been implemented by the Department of Defense. Concerning the savings plan provision, I am somewhat puzzled as to why the Department of Defense has chosen not to implement it. We provided the Department of Defense with this particular authority with the full expectation that it would be implemented.

As most of my colleagues know, many of our military personnel are deployed to the Persian Gulf on very short notice. They did not have a lot of time to think about or make banking arrangements that would return them a favorable yield. I am talking here mainly about our single military personnel who may not have anyone they can turn to to help them put their money away prudently. It would be very difficult, if not impossible, for many of these personnel in foxholes or out there on duty in the desert to buy certificates of deposit or money market certificates for themselves, as some have suggested. Therefore, I believe we should require the Department of Defense to implement the savings plan we authorized last year, and that is the purpose of the bill I am introducing today.

In recognition of other concerns I have about the fair treatment of our men and women in uniform deployed in the Persian Gulf, on January 14, I introduced with Senator MCCAIN, a set of four bills. That is in addition to those I just mentioned. I hope the committees of jurisdiction will act expeditiously on these bills so they can be enacted early in this session of Congress.

The first bill would exclude military earnings accrued by a member while serving in the Persian Gulf in Operation Desert Shield from Federal income taxes. The exclusion would apply to the entire amount of military income for enlisted personnel and to the first \$2,000 of monthly military income

for officers. Current law provides this exclusion for members in combat zones. With what is going on right now, it may not be very long until that qualification is met. I think our military personnel in the Persian Gulf are just as close as you can get to combat without the bullets actually flying, and they certainly deserve this exclusion whether or not war starts in the next 48 or 72 hours, a week, or whatever. I introduced a similar bill, S. 3027, last year. The bill was referred to the Finance Committee. However, time ran out in the last session before the committee could take action on it. I urge, as strongly as I can state, for the Finance Committee to act expeditiously on this bill so we can vote on it early in this session.

The second bill would permit military personnel serving in the Persian Gulf to delay filing a 1990 Federal income tax return until 6 months after their deployment ends without any penalty. I know that Senator DOLE and Senator MITCHELL have introduced a similar bill that would provide an extension of 60 days, and I have signed up as a cosponsor on that bill, because I believe that Federal income tax filing relief is necessary, but obviously I believe that a longer period of time is preferable, and that is why I am introducing this bill.

I point out that current law provides for a 6-month delay for military personnel in combat zones. As I said before, this bill may become moot one of these days if we actually go into combat. But as of now, I think it is only fair to provide a 6 month suspension.

The bill I am introducing would extend that 6-month coverage for military personnel serving in the Persian Gulf in Operation Desert Shield for tax year 1990. This bill, in all likelihood, will also be referred to the Finance Committee, and again, I ask the committee to act expeditiously on this bill so we can vote on it early in this session.

I know there is some concern about the delay in receipt of revenue the longer the period of extension for filing. However, I think we need to recognize that many of our returning military personnel will face a very turbulent transition. Returning reservists have to readjust to civilian employment or reestablishing their businesses. In some cases, they must find housing. Active component personnel who may be returning for separation may be hunting for jobs and a place to live. Returning active component personnel may be transferring to other units, with all that entails, changing bank accounts, locations, and housing, and other personal matters. It seems to me that these considerations argue for a 6-month extension, notwithstanding the delay in receipt in revenues.

The third bill would provide flexibility to the Department of Defense to re-

call retired military personnel to active duty in the highest grade they held while previously on active duty. Under current law, the Department of Defense can recall retired military personnel to active duty only in the grade in which they retired. Within the retired military community, there are a number of individuals who voluntarily retired in a grade lower than they held while on active duty. For example, there are a number of medical personnel who are under retired recall orders who chose to retire in a lower grade because they chose not to serve the 3 years in grade required to retire in their serving grade. I think that as a matter of fairness, we should provide the flexibility to the Department of Defense to recall these personnel in the highest grade that they served in while on active duty. Because some of these personnel are already under recall orders, my bill would make this authority retroactive to the beginning of Operation Desert Shield.

Finally, the fourth bill introduced January 14 would equalize the unemployment compensation between separated military personnel who are unemployed and civilian personnel who are unemployed. Under current law, military personnel are entitled to only 13 weeks of unemployment compensation if they are unemployed 1 month after separating from service. On the other hand, civilian personnel are entitled to 26 weeks of unemployment compensation if they are unemployed 1 week after job separation. My bill would make the military entitlement the same as the civilian entitlement. Certainly, our people deserve nothing less than that. The provisions of this bill were included in the defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1991 that the Senate passed last year. The provision was part of a transition package to aid military personnel who would be separating because of active duty military strength reductions by the military services over the next 5 years.

Because of jurisdictional concerns raised by the House Ways and Means Committee in our conference on the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991 last year, this particular provision was not adopted. I believe we have a commitment from the Senate Finance Committee to consider this matter early in this session, and I hope we can get this passed.

This provision is needed even more now because many military personnel who had intended to separate at the end of their service obligation have been involuntarily extended under the stop loss authority implemented by the Department of Defense. I expect that once the stop loss is lifted, there will be a relatively large exodus from the military. Many of these people have lost their prospective employment and will enter the job market at ground

zero. I think we need to keep this in mind as we consider this proposal.

Mr. President, that summarizes the contents of the five bills I have introduced. I believe these bills provide for the fair and responsible treatment of our men and women in uniform deployed to the Persian Gulf in Operation Desert Shield. I think it is fair to say that all of them are certainly in harms way over there and that we certainly want to support them fully.

Mr. President, I also hope we can bring a just settlement in the Persian Gulf at this late date without going to war. That is my fervent hope and prayer. But, if we have to go to war, then I think we must do everything we can to make sure our forces prevail at the lowest cost in casualties. I have the highest confidence that our men and women in uniform will prevail if we go to war, they deserve our full support as they stand prepared to do exactly that.

Mr. President, because we introduced this legislation rather rapidly, and because we are not in our regular legislative procedure quite yet, I did not have the opportunity to circulate this to as many people for cosponsorship. I anticipate that a number of Senators will want to cosponsor any or all of these bills that I have introduced, that were introduced on Monday of this week and those that I have spoken about here today.

If any of the offices that may be watching or listening desire more information, please contact my office. We welcome cosponsorships on this legislation. Without exception, the Senate wants to make certain that we do what is right for our people over there and would be happy to cosponsor this legislation, and I welcome such cosponsorship.

Mr. President, just one final note, I have been chagrined, or I have been surprised that the Defense Department did not move more rapidly in these areas, some of which we are addressing by legislation again. I was surprised that in the interest of being completely fair with our people over there, the Defense Department had not opted on their own to make sure that all of these benefits were in place and operating.

We should not have to take committee action unless there is something that is not in legislation with authority for them to act.

I hope that in the interest of dealing fairly with the people over there, the Defense Department would take the initiative to address the benefits that our men and women deserve. That is what we are addressing with this legislation.

So I hope we will have the full support of both the Defense Department and the administration in this endeavor.

We look forward to the cosponsorship of as many Senators that want to be

cosponsors. Contact me or my staff, give the office a call and we will be happy to add them as cosponsors.

I give credit to Senator MCCAIN whom we worked with on this legislation. He has played a big part in this and I am sure he will have his own statement that he will make on the floor.

I wanted to make certain we would get this out so that as many people as possible can start considering this legislation so we can guarantee early passage when we go back in regular session in a couple of weeks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBB). The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALLIES SHOULD PAY COST OF PERSIAN GULF OPERATIONS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, Senator D'AMATO of New York and I have introduced a resolution that calls upon our President to ask Saudi Arabia to pay the entire costs of Operation Desert Shield from the windfall profits it is making from the sale of oil. Saudi Arabia is making nearly a billion dollars per week extra profit, or about \$52 billion per year extra profit on the sale of oil.

This may sound like something that is introduced for purposes of making a point, as opposed to really trying to accomplish something, but I think it can be accomplished.

I recall going to Saudi Arabia last August with a group of Senators and meeting with King Fahd and his brother and his nephew, all of whom occupy the highest positions in the Saudi Arabian Government. They were somewhat startled by the demand of our group that Saudi Arabia pay more of the costs of Operation Desert Shield. That led me to the conclusion that our State Department and our administration are sometimes a bit timid in expressing how strongly the American people feel about getting more help in paying for the military operations in the Persian Gulf. I believe that our diplomats, perhaps the administration, maybe even the Secretary of State, have not forcefully stated to leaders of other countries how strongly the American people feel about the need for our allies—not only Saudi Arabia, but also Kuwait, Japan, Europe, and the other nations of the world—to contribute more to our common effort.

Today I learned that our projected budget deficit could increase to between \$300 to \$400 billion this year. In this Chamber, next September and October, when we are finalizing the budget, we will find ourselves faced by a much bigger deficit than we had last year. We all remember what a great struggle we had coming to a budget agreement last year and what a spectacle Congress became in the process. Indeed, the size of the budget deficit will be even worse this year.

With that in mind, I urge our President, our Congress and our Government to make renewed demands and requests to Japan, European governments, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, as well as other nations of the world, for assistance in what Uncle Sam is doing.

It is true that some funds have been paid by these nations, and more have been pledged. The fact of the matter is that our National Guardsmen who have been called to active duty, for example, are losing ground financially. They are working, for the most part, at a lower salary than their civilian salaries. This will create a loss of revenue to the Federal Government. The efforts in the Persian Gulf, however they come out, will be expensive for years to come.

I do not know what will happen. I hope and pray we have peace. I was one of those Senators who voted to give the President the authority he needs to achieve objectives we all agree with, and we are all hoping and praying that negotiations will make war unnecessary. But whether it is necessary or unnecessary, I think that we should renew our efforts on the resolution Senator D'AMATO and I have introduced, and on which we will attempt to get a vote. It is not binding on Saudi Arabia, but it would have our Government ask that they pay the entire cost of the war out of their excess oil profits.

In addition to that, we should undertake stronger efforts along these lines with Japan. I remember standing on the deck of the U.S.S. *Wisconsin* and seeing a Japanese oil tanker go by with free American protection. Our European friends actually have a greater interest in the outcome of this crisis than we in terms of oil supplies.

As we move through this crisis, it is this Senator's view that our administration should make a greater effort to seek foreign contributions.

Let me say that almost every Senator here who holds listening meetings in his home State—and I am sure almost all of us do—will find that our citizens are demanding this action very strongly. I plan to hold some additional listening meetings and town meetings the weekend after this, and I am sure that this will be a topic on many peoples' minds. The American people are willing to do their share but are not willing to do more than their fair share.

Many of our allies have made great fanfare about sending a boat, two boats or three boats to the gulf to observe and report. Let us be clear that some of these ships were already in the Mediterranean or at sea and are now involved in the gulf at little additional cost. We are doing the real thing. We are supplying the fighters, paying the real cost, providing the frontline personnel—and all of this is very expensive and will be expensive for years to come. If we get into a situation where people are injured, there will be veterans' hospital bills to be paid for years to come. Benefits will accrue to the people involved that will be an expense to the taxpayers for years to come. It is not just the immediate incremental budgetary impact. So I think the American taxpayer deserves the break suggested by the D'Amato-Pressler resolution.

I know that our President and his Secretary of State have had to pull together a coalition. I hope we have not made promises of more aid to some countries that have provided assistance to Operation Desert Shield. In short, I hope that next September and October, when we are in this Chamber doing the budget and working to reduce a \$320 billion deficit, that we are not told we were not aggressive enough in asking for some financial help from some of our allies around the world who are benefiting so much from our actions.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY MULLENBURG

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, whenever a member of my staff moves along, it is quite natural to me to feel both sad and glad. Sad, because as my colleagues are all too aware, a really good member of our official family is not easy to find. Glad, because I want to see my employees stretch their minds, their capacities, and grow. We have all been staff at one time or another.

Having said that, I want to take this opportunity to wish a former member of my Appropriations Subcommittee staff, Terry Mullenburg, all the best as she moves to her new position as staff director of the Connecticut State Office here in Washington, DC. Terry has been a Senate staffer for almost 10 years, beginning and ending her tenure on the Appropriations Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, with 4 years in between on the Labor and Human Resources Disability Policy Subcommittee. In all of her capacities, she has focused on health, education, and civil rights issues.

Terry's 10 years in the Senate speak volumes as to her capabilities—she will be sorely missed not only for her competence but her wit and good humor. It is a pleasure to join with her many friends in wishing her all the best in her new position.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARKIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGARDING SOVIET ACTIONS IN THE BALTIC STATES—SENATE RESOLUTION 14

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am authorized by the majority leader and the minority leader to make the following request. It has been cleared with them both.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a Senate resolution and ask unanimous consent that consideration of the resolution, if granted, have the following condition: That no amendments to the resolution be in order.

I send to the desk a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 14) to express the sense of the Senate that the President should review economic benefits provided to the Soviet Union in light of the crisis in the Baltic States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request by the distinguished Senator is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the resolution in its entirety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 14

Whereas, on January 7, the Soviet Defense Ministry announced the deployment of additional troops to the republics of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova (formerly Moldavia), and the Ukraine.

Whereas President Gorbachev has threatened to impose direct "presidential rule" on Lithuania in place of the democratically elected Government of Lithuania.

Whereas the peaceful resistance of the Lithuanian people has been met with brutal and violent actions by the Soviet armed forces.

Whereas, on January 11, more than a dozen people were killed and over one hundred injured when Soviet troops stormed and took control of the Lithuanian Republic's radio and television station effectively cutting off the Lithuanian Government's chief means of communication with the Lithuanian people.

Whereas the United States has never recognized the forcible annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

Whereas the United States Government has repeatedly communicated to President Gorbachev that the use of force in the Baltic States could seriously jeopardize United States-Soviet relations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that:

SECTION 1. The President should (i) immediately review all economic benefits provided by the United States Government to the Soviet Union, (ii) expeditiously report to the Congress on whether those benefits should be suspended in light of Soviet actions in the Baltic States, (iii) immediately suspend all ongoing technical exchanges, (iv) consider withdrawing United States support for Soviet membership in the IMF, World Bank, or GATT, and (v) not proceed with the provision of MFN trade treatment until the following events have occurred:

(a) Soviet troops refrain from obstructing the functioning of the democratic governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

(b) The troops that were deployed following the January 7 announcement by the Soviet Defense Ministry are withdrawn;

(c) Soviet authorities cease their interference with the telecommunications, print, and other media in these states;

(d) Good-faith negotiations between the democratically elected governments of the Baltic States and the Soviet Union on the restoration of the sovereignty of those states have begun;

(e) Concrete assurances are received from President Gorbachev that grain purchased with United States credits will not be used to coerce the Baltic States, or any republic of the Soviet Union, to sign the Union Treaty.

SEC. 2. The United States should consult with and encourage our allies to follow a policy similar to that outlined in section 1.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, and I submit it on behalf of myself and Senator MITCHELL, Senator DOLE, Senators BRADLEY, LUGAR, SIMON, RIEGLE, NICKLES, HELMS, D'AMATO, MIKULSKI, DECONCINI, GRAHAM, LAUTENBERG, INOUE, BRYAN, JOHNSTON, LEVIN, MOYNIHAN, SMITH, MCCAIN, RUDMAN, KASTEN, CONRAD, and KENNEDY.

Mr. President, I hope for other co-sponsors before the Senate takes action on the resolution.

Mr. President, I rise today to express my outrage and my sadness and my dismay at the bloody crackdown that began over the weekend in Lithuania and now appears to be spreading to Latvia.

Events of the last year and a half had bolstered the hope that the long suffering people of the Baltic nations might finally achieve their freedom and independence, to which they are entitled.

Glasnost and perestroika in the Soviet Union and the emergence of democracy across Eastern Europe fostered a feeling of optimism. Obviously, the fulfillment of that hope and optimism is slipping away from the Baltic peoples.

President Gorbachev has said that he did not order the troops to open fire on

the unarmed civilians, but he cannot dodge responsibility so easily.

Over the past months, he has refused to negotiate seriously with the duly elected governments in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

His government approved the deployment of thousands of Soviet troops under the guise of rounding up draft evaders. He must have known of the well coordinated military occupation, even if he did not approve the use of force. Regardless of who gave the specific order, it is Mr. Gorbachev and the Soviet leadership who must be held responsible for the violence and deaths.

If Mr. Gorbachev was not aware of the planned action in Lithuania, then a more serious question arises as to whether he remains in control of his nation's internal security apparatus. If he did not give the order, has he lost power to the conservative hard liners? If the order did not come from the Kremlin leadership, is the military taking power into its own hands and stepping in to restore order? Whatever the answers are, there is a need to re-examine United States policy toward the Baltic nations and the Soviet Union.

A prophetic Washington Post editorial on April 25, 1990, pointed out that the "danger in the United States" muted response so far is that it is susceptible to being interpreted as acquiescence, encouraging the Soviets to go farther. Developments in the Baltic countries over the past few weeks show that we are now reaping the bitter fruits of that perceived acquiescence. The Soviets deployed thousands of additional troops into the Baltic States with the excuse of looking for draft dodgers. Soviet forces surrounded and occupied Government security buildings, printing operations, and communications facilities. Over the past months the Soviet leadership has refused to conduct good-faith negotiations with the freely elected governments of the Baltic nations, despite promises to do so. As the crisis worsened last week, the Soviet Government declined even to meet with Lithuania's representative in Moscow. Finally, violence erupted in the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius as Soviet troops occupied key installations around the city. Troops have begun to occupy buildings in Riga, the capital of Latvia.

During this escalation, the administration has winked and nodded and looked the other way as the Soviets have engaged in a process of "creeping crackdown" in the Baltic countries.

It is true that the President has publicly condemned the action, but it comes late. Perhaps that was the price for ensuring Soviet cooperation in the Persian Gulf; I do not know for sure. If it was, then it seems to me to have been a poor bargain.

Obviously, the Soviet timing of these latest steps was intended to take ad-

vantage of our preoccupation with events in the Middle East. The Soviets had, until now, avoided a Tiananmen Square-type incident, apparently hoping that, without such a focal point, the world's attention would remain focused elsewhere. Indeed our attention has been unavoidably fixed on the crisis in the Persian Gulf, but this blatant use of force to perpetuate the subjugation of the Baltic people must not go without rebuke. It would be a travesty to concentrate so much of our Nation's energy on stopping Iraqi aggression and freeing Kuwait, while ignoring Soviet aggression in the captive Baltic nations.

In many ways, the Soviets are repeating their original illegal occupation of the Baltic States, and repeating more than that. What we have seen on the evening news has been a repetition of the actions that we saw years ago when the Soviets paraded their tanks through the streets of the capitals of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other East European countries.

In 1939, the Soviet Union signed mutual nonaggression treaties with each of the Baltic States. These treaties allowed the Soviets to station troops in those countries. The Soviets then claimed that those troops were attacked and used that excuse for sending in reinforcements and cracking down on the existing regimes. Of course, the ultimate outcome was the forced incorporation, which we have never recognized as being legal, of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

We have never recognized it. We do not recognize it now. We are now witnessing a second violation of those mutual nonaggression treaties. I fear that the end result will be the same as it was in 1940.

Since the Baltic States reasserted their independence last spring, the United States has sent mixed signals to the Soviet leadership. We have continued to pay lip service to our longstanding policy of not recognizing the illegal occupation of the Baltic countries of the Soviet Union. At the same time we were engaging in negotiations to widen economic ties and extend trade benefits to the Soviet Union.

I have been in favor of that. I think the hopes of Americans and peoples everywhere have been raised by what we have seen occurring in the Soviet Union over the last couple of years. But now are we to see our hopes dashed by the same king of repression to which we so long became accustomed under the hard liners, under the old regimes?

We must make clear to Mr. Gorbachev where we stand. There should be no confusion in our response to this latest brutal crackdown by the Soviet Union in Lithuania. It is wrong. There is no question about that.

There are 100 Senators who know that. Every man and every woman who

graces a desk in this United States Senate knows that is wrong. It is a brutal crackdown. We should have no hesitancy, and should have no compunctions about saying so.

The continuation of repressive policies by the Soviet Union threatens to unravel the progress that our two countries have made in recent years on a broad range of issues. In light of the events of this weekend, I believe that the United States should suspend any trade and economic assistance to the Soviet Union.

As the President has said so often in recent weeks, aggression must not be rewarded. And I hope that 100 voices in this Senate today will by their votes say that, and let it be loud and clear.

Senators MITCHELL, DOLE, other Senators, and I are submitting this resolution that urges the President to review the possibility of such actions and to report to Congress on his decision.

I hope that the Senate will vote unanimously to adopt this position, and make it clear beyond any semblance of doubt that violent solutions to legitimate political controversies are not going to be accepted as business as usual in the new international order.

Mr. President, there are a good many Senators who are away from the Hill today. I will not ask for a rollcall vote. I would much prefer that, if Senators were all in town. But I did not want to ask for a rollcall vote when there would be Senators on both sides of the aisle who would miss that vote. I hope that other Senators will cosponsor this resolution, and that we can by our voices cast our votes and let the message be loud and clear to the Soviet Union. Let the peoples of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania hear it, too. I expect they are pretty lonely. And we should not let them think they are forgotten.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ROCKEFELLER, my colleague from West Virginia, be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, before the quorum call begins, I ask unanimous consent that Senator DOMENICI, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. HARKIN and Mr. EXON be added as cosponsors to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished President pro tempore for his resolution calling for a concrete United States response to Soviet violence against the Lithuanian people.

The United States must to register its protest with specific actions.

This resolution calls on the President to suspend bilateral technical exchanges, consider withdrawing support for Soviet membership in international economic organizations, refuse to grant the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status, and possibly take other measures until all newly deployed Soviet troops are withdrawn from the Baltic States, the freely elected Baltic governments regain control of their territory, and good faith negotiations to resolve the issue of Baltic independence have begun.

I am pleased to join in cosponsoring this important measure.

It is appropriate and prudent for the United States Senate to express its clear and unequivocal condemnation for the Soviet military's action against innocent civilians and for its apparent attempt to extinguish Baltic independence.

President Gorbachev and other Soviet officials should harbor no illusions about the serious effect that violence against peaceful demonstrators will have upon relations between our two countries.

Secretary Baker frequently notes that Saddam Hussein repeatedly miscalculated in his actions during the Gulf crisis.

Secretary Baker neglected to say that apparent American acquiescence to Iraqi claims against Kuwait may have contributed to the seriousness of Saddam's miscalculation.

I am concerned that if the United States fails to make clear the potential consequences of violent repression by the Soviet military, Soviet officials may mistakenly assume that violence against the Baltic States can go unnoticed in the midst of the current Persian Gulf crisis.

The relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union is too important to permit such a tragic miscalculation.

We owe it to ourselves, the Soviets, and the people of the Baltic States to make plain the seriousness with which the United States views the violent crackdown.

The world cannot ignore the military suppression of the Baltic peoples' peaceful claim to independence.

For five decades, the United States has refused to recognize the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

For 50 years, the United States has supported the right of the Baltic States to regain their independence.

The United States cannot abandon the courageous people of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

It is therefore appropriate to call upon President Bush to suspend certain United States economic benefits to the Soviet Union until the Soviet military halts its violent intervention in the Baltic States.

Yesterday I called upon President Gorbachev to prevent further violence and return to a peaceful process of negotiating Baltic independence.

Failure to do so will, as this resolution makes clear, have serious consequences for relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Soviet occupation of the Baltics, which is the matter that Senate Resolution 14 concerns.

Mr. President, last month when Eduard Shevardnadze resigned his position as Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, he did so in a very dramatic statement before his whole country, and he did so by saying that he resigned in large part because he believed, in his words, that "dictatorship was gaining ground" in the Soviet Union.

In the days and weeks that have followed his resignation, one can only say that he knew things that the rest of us did not, because in the weeks since his resignation, the Soviet Union has militarily occupied the Baltic States for the third time in 50 years.

The Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—were illegally annexed into the Soviet Union as a result of the Soviet-Nazi treaty of 1939. The United States has never recognized that incorporation, yet the Soviets have continued to occupy those nations for 50 years.

In February of last year in Lithuania, there was an election—the first democratic election in almost 50 years—and a government was elected and took power. Since that time, the Soviet Union has systematically attempted to repress or suppress the governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

In the last several weeks, armored personnel carriers have crossed into Latvia. Paratroopers have landed in Estonia. And, over the weekend, there were many deaths—many more than have thus far been reported—at the hands of Soviet armed forces.

To add insult to bloody injury, on Soviet television on Sunday night, a Stalinist figure—the Interior Minister, Mr. Boris Pugo—went on television to state that those who had been killed in Lithuania were killed in self-defense. That

statement was as offensive to the values of common decency we hold in this country as the statement of the Chinese Government in years past that the massacres of students in Tiananmen Square did not happen. We saw those massacres in Tiananmen Square. And last week we saw on our television sets Soviet military officers firing and brutally attacking unarmed civilians in the Baltics.

I was a member of a Senate delegation last April that went to the Soviet Union, and, in a meeting with President Gorbachev, that delegation conveyed to him directly that any use of force in the Baltics would have grave consequences for our bilateral relationship. It was not a subtlety. It was a direct statement of Mr. Gorbachev himself.

The events of the last 2 weeks add a sense of urgency for the Senate to act. Last Saturday morning at 3 a.m., the Senate agreed to a resolution that I submitted, a resolution which called upon Mr. Gorbachev not to use force in the Baltics. Today Senator BYRD, Senator DOLE, and many other Senators have introduced a resolution that calls on the President to immediately review all economic benefits provided by the United States Government to the Soviet Union and to report to Congress on whether those benefits should be suspended in light of Soviet actions toward the Baltic States, to suspend all technical exchanges and consider opposing Soviet membership in the IMF and the World Bank and GATT, until, among other things, good-faith negotiations between the democratically elected governments of the Baltic States and the Soviet Union on self-determination for those states have at least begun.

What is happening in the Senate through, first, the resolution on Saturday morning and, second, the resolution today is that the Senate is expressing itself in increasingly strong tones about the events that have taken place in Lithuania and in Latvia and in Estonia.

Even as we talk, the democratically elected government of Lithuania sits in its parliament buildings surrounded by Soviet military forces. Those legislators in those parliament buildings are risking their own lives to support democratic principles that we have held dear and defined as the essence of America since our founding.

It is imperative that we take action that is even stronger than the action we took with my resolution last Saturday morning, an action that is even stronger than the action contemplated in this resolution, which I hope will be passed overwhelmingly in the Senate today. That is why I hope at some point in the near future we will also consider a resolution that responds to Soviet actions in the Baltics, by saying that the Export-Import Bank may not

issue any payment or insurance or guarantee financing exports to the Soviet Union; that the Soviet Union shall not be eligible to receive nondiscriminatory MFN treatment; that the United States would not proceed with any membership of the Soviet Union in GATT or the IMF; and that we oppose any waiver of restrictions of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development as it pertains to the application of the Soviet Union for membership.

In addition, Mr. President, I believe we should rescind whatever additional authority the President stated in December he would seek to give the Soviet Union in terms of increased agricultural credit.

Those are the range of options and actions that I believe are appropriate at this time. I believe these steps must be taken so that we in the Senate, after having made a very direct statement to President Gorbachev himself, have acted upon what we said: using force in the Baltic would have grave consequences. It is just not possible to pretend that a brutal repression in the Baltic did not take place. We have seen this on television, just as we saw the massacre of the students in Tiananmen Square. Each should equally offend our moral and political principles and each requires us to take action.

So, when the Senate's action today is reported, let no one assume that that is the end. This is a stronger resolution than the resolution that passed on Saturday morning, and there will be stronger resolutions, so the Soviet Union will understand that our values and our action coincide.

It would be a sad irony if, as a result of Soviet support for freeing Kuwait, we would acquiesce in Soviet aggression in a small, illegally annexed country, such as Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania. We cannot fail to take action.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

CRISIS IN LITHUANIA

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, while the world was awaiting the outbreak of war in the Persian Gulf this weekend, hostilities broke out in the Baltic States. The Soviet Union sent its Army to crush the people of Lithuania—in some cases literally to crush to death Lithuanians lying down in the streets in peaceful protest. Soviet soldiers have killed 14 civilians so far, including a woman in a wedding dress. Latvia and Estonia will probably be next.

The Soviets apparently believe that with the eyes of the world riveted on the Persian Gulf, they can mount military coups in the Baltic States without major repercussions. The Soviet leaders are assuming that the world com-

munity can only handle one crisis at a time. This resolution will help to show them that they are wrong.

I urge the administration to join the Congress in showing the Soviets that there will be no business as usual as long as repression continues. Specifically, we should suspend agricultural credits immediately. Our agricultural sale should be restricted to the freely elected governments of the Soviet Union. These are the republics and some of the major cities, which are now the lonely centers of liberty among the growing conservative forces.

I also believe that the President should postpone his summit meeting with President Gorbachev until the current wave of repression stops. This is no time to meet with a leader who is either supporting military repression or who is incapable of preventing it.

When the Baltic States courageously assumed their independence last March, I urged the administration to grant official and immediate recognition to the new democratic Baltic governments. Specifically, I favored upgrading the existing Baltic Diplomatic missions in the United States from legations to fullfledged embassies and appointing a U.S. ambassador to each republic. These moves would be even more important today. They would express our solidarity with the Baltic peoples at a time when they may well feel that they have been abandoned by the West.

Unless we react strongly to this wave of repression, we will send a signal to the growing conservative forces in the Soviet Union that we are indifferent not only to the Baltics' fate, but to the fate of glasnost and perestroika in general. Unless they are put on notice that repression is unacceptable, they will continue to eat away at the freely elected governments throughout the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, the principle that the Soviets are attempting to crush in the Baltics—the right of small states to independence—is exactly what the world community is trying to ensure in the Persian Gulf. Fifty-one years ago, Stalin invaded the Baltic States as part of a secret pact with Nazi Germany, and the whole world stood by. Today, we must not stand by. We must mount a determined diplomatic effort to ensure that the repression of the Baltics ends.

The fate of small, weak nations is not a new subject. Many leaders have spoken eloquently about it, including President John Kennedy. It was nearly 28 years ago that he delivered a magnificent speech on this subject in Dublin:

No nation, large or small, can be indifferent to the fate of others near or far *** it matters not how small a nation is that seeks world peace and freedom *** for the humblest nation of all the world, "when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error."

Those words ring as true today, whether it be in the gulf or the Baltics.

In another speech, perhaps the most dramatic of his career, President Kennedy went to Berlin shortly after the construction of the wall in 1961 to declare that he was a Berliner. Today we must not allow the Berlin Wall to be replaced by a wall around the Baltics. For Lithuania and the rest of the Baltic States belong to the vision of a free Europe just as much as the newly liberated peoples of Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

The fate of the Baltic was also a central element in another famous speech in which Winston Churchill mentioned the Iron Curtain for the first time, in 1946. That Iron Curtain now has fallen in Eastern Europe, but we cannot allow it to go up again around the Baltics. This curtain, these walls, must come down if the cold war is to be truly over. Europe will not be entirely free until the Baltics have recovered the independence that was taken from them.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I first of all commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the President pro tempore of the Senate, for originating this particular resolution and commend the respective leaders, the majority leader, Senator MITCHELL, and minority leader, Senator DOLE, for their support of this resolution that is now before the Senate. I am delighted, Mr. President, to be a cosponsor of this resolution.

It was just 4 days ago that I spoke in this Chamber on the situation in the Baltic States. Since that time, of course, dramatic events have occurred, especially in Vilnius, Lithuania. President Gorbachev, as we now know, has either acted or acquiesced to military action by his military leaders in direct contrast, I would note, Mr. President, to the words which stand behind his Nobel Peace Prize. I say that regretfully. Mr. President, we Americans are an optimistic people by nature, I think, who prefer to deal in good faith with almost everyone we come in contact with. Maybe somewhat naively we are ready to assume the best of almost every foreign leader.

And if we err, Mr. President, in our judgment of others it is because we are anxious I think to attribute rationality, humanity, a dedication of progress to others.

We, Mr. President, try to protect the values that generally motivate Americans into other foreign leaders. But from time to time, we are disappointed when a leader who has given the world so much to hope for and so much to be hopeful about acts in a ruthless fashion. Mr. President, there is no other

conclusion one can draw, and make no mistake about it, the events and actions in Lithuania, and the threats that are occurring in Estonia and Latvia, what has occurred at the hands of the Soviet Union and its leaders in the last several days has been ruthless.

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President, what has happened in the Soviet Union during the past 5 years is still historic and breathtaking by any account, but so is the reversal of the past 5 days in the Baltic States. What it teaches us regrettably, Mr. President, is to try and rid ourselves of some of our illusions and start to follow events in the Soviet Union in a more hard-headed fashion. The transformation the Soviet Union must undergo was never really expected to be as smooth as many wanted it. After last Sunday when Soviet tanks squashed unarmed civilians in Vilnius, we learned how far the Soviet Union has yet to travel on the road to democracy and freedom.

The inane assertions that the Lithuanians started it all, the suddenly emerging, as we see, Moscow stooges masquerading as "national salvation committees," the whole web, Mr. President, of pitiful lies causes me to wonder if, in fact, there has really been the fundamental change that we had hoped for in Moscow.

Four days ago, I stated that the Soviet reform process had reached a crossroads where the room for further marginal steps had been exhausted and the only remaining alternatives would be either a bold step ahead, or restoration. Mr. Gorbachev seems to have made his choice, at least that is what it appears to be today, and in carrying it out, he relies on the methods he learned from his former mentors, Mr. Andropov and Mr. Suslov.

While in many ways, we recall the tragic events in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Afghanistan, one aspect is certainly different: Those invasions were the reactions of a Soviet power that was still robust and potent for the time being. Today's Soviet power is that of a dying brute, lashing out for the last time to delay the inevitable. There is nothing that can save the Soviet Union as we know it, the least of all this shameful attack on the Baltic nations.

Lithuania is not alone. Hungary was alone in 1956. The idea of independence has permeated every constituent republic. Even the elected President of the Russian republic, Boris Yeltsin, is a strong critic of the invasion, and on Saturday rushed to Estonia to courageously declare solidarity with the Baltic States and endorse their independence. It was held for many years that the major ingredient of Soviet expansionism had been Russian nationalism. One has to ask the intriguing question: What would be Soviet power without Russia?

The fact that the dying Soviet power singled out Lithuania to create a precedent to intimidate all other republics' independence movement lends further infamy to the Kremlin decision. First, the Baltic States' independence was crushed barely 50 years ago as a result of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. This makes their occupation even more illegitimate and outrageous than those of other peoples under Soviet control, that is if we can establish degrees of legitimacy in this matter at all. Moreover, no other republic went about regaining its independence in the same disciplined and cultured fashion as did the Baltic nations. Many other republics are ravaged by internal ethnic conflicts, bloody rivalries regardless of the problems of Soviet domination. But if what happened in the Baltics in the past few years is a revolution, then that was the most gentle, most civilized, most humane, most disciplined revolution mankind has ever known.

Finally, Mr. President, there is one other aspect in this crisis where history must not repeat itself and that is our reaction to this outrage. We must not allow the Hungary-Suez parallel of 1956 to replay itself. I do not know how much our preoccupation with the gulf events has entered Mr. Gorbachev's calculations, but I have no doubt that he tries, or is trying to take advantage of it. Let us provide him with another entry: sanctions. He has made his choice, let us make ours. Most of us were ready to support a reforming and liberalizing Soviet Union to a significant extent. We started to provide generous food credits and considered several other forms of assistance. We, however, want to help Mr. Gorbachev only in one direction, and that ought to be abundantly clear, and that is forward.

Now that he has switched into reverse, so shall we switch, in my view, into reverse with our assistance. No American credits, no favors, to bail out a rotting system that reverts to its old brutal self. Those inspiring, intelligent, courageous Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians deserve no less from us, Mr. President.

Again, Mr. President, like my colleague from New Jersey and others, I urge the overwhelming adoption of this resolution. Maybe, just maybe, Mr. President, this resolution, while it is nothing more than a series of words, does bespeak of some actions I hope we will be prepared to take in sending a message before more blood is shed and before more steps are taken that could reverse the tremendous effort that the Baltic nations have made in the last several years to achieve their democratic independence.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be added as a cosponsor to the pending resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, although we are understandably preoccupied with Persian Gulf crisis, we cannot ignore the reality of events in the Baltic Republics. The introduction of paratroops to the region and their use of lethal force deeply concerns and disturbs us all.

We in this body, and across the country, have a responsibility to raise our voices in protest of Moscow's escalating efforts to strangle the people of the Baltics. Even though our attention is focused on the gulf, we must remind President Gorbachev that his timing will never be good for this kind of violent crackdown. We are watching, Mr. Gorbachev, and we do care.

President Gorbachev must be reminded of our deep desire that the question of independence for the Baltic and other republics be resolved by peaceful, negotiated means.

The killings of some 14 unarmed civilians, coupled with the seizure of broadcast and other media facilities, and the possible seizure and dissolution of the freely elected Baltic parliaments represents a serious escalation in the level of violence, tension, and instability in the region.

The threat that President Gorbachev will impose direct Presidential rule over the republics is real and it is disturbing. The whole series of recent events calls directly into question Gorbachev's commitment to perestroika and glasnost. We acknowledge he has a difficult task.

He has secured enormous strides forward in opening up his country, improving democratization and individual liberties. And, correctly, the United States has been supportive and encouraging of these important advances.

However, Mr. Gorbachev risks losing all he has gained if this trend toward violent repression continues to escalate. If Mr. Gorbachev takes too many steps backward, it becomes increasingly difficult for him and his country to resume their forward progress.

Mr. President, given events in recent days and weeks, this Senator believes it is essential that the United States seriously review its policies toward the Soviet Union. This review must encompass the full range of United States-Soviet relations—diplomatic, economic, political, arms control, and all other aspects of our relations. I urge President Bush to evaluate closely U.S. in-

terests in this context as he considers the appropriate response.

There have been suggestions that President Bush consider postponing or canceling the upcoming summit meeting with President Gorbachev in protest over events in the Baltics. I do not believe that is appropriate. President Bush should use the opportunity of a summit to express directly and assertively to Gorbachev the deep concern we feel on this matter. The summit would also provide an important forum for President Bush to make clear to Gorbachev the consequences that continued violence has for United States-Soviet relations.

Mr. President, these are difficult times for us all. We are anxious and uneasy about the standoff in the Persian Gulf. But we cannot permit our preoccupation with the gulf to blind us to the rest of the world, and especially now, to events in the Baltics. We are clearly at a turning point in the Middle East and we may well be approaching a moment of important decision vis-a-vis the Soviet Union as well.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Soviet tanks that are today brutally defining the limits of glasnost and perestroika in the Baltic States, may ultimately crush beneath their treads humanity's aspirations for a new world order based on respect for the sovereignty of nations and the rights of man. Indeed, progress toward a world of free, independent nations at peace with one another may be more significantly reversed by the Kremlin's cruel repression of Lithuania than by Saddam Hussein's aggression in the Persian Gulf.

Even in the headiest days of liberalization in the Soviet Union and liberation in Eastern Europe, one could always sense the Kremlin's apprehension over the dynamics unleashed by Soviet reform policies. Yet, with each new advance of freedom within what once was called the Soviet Empire, the West had increasingly come to expect Moscow's toleration of rising nationalism and political instability as the inevitable early consequences of reform and modernization. We had come to hope that an enlightened Soviet leadership would endure the changes necessary to resuscitate their society and to become a responsible member of the international community. I fear that we may have let our hopes confound the lessons of experience.

In the historical drama now unfolding in Lithuania there are enough parallels to historical Soviet aggression to discourage even the most determined optimist. In 1956, the Soviets exploited the world's preoccupation with the Suez crisis to use the occasion to begin their bloody suppression of Hungarian freedom. In 1968, Vietnam absorbed the attention of the West, while Soviet tanks rolled into Prague to make plain

Moscow's contempt for even limited political reform within its empire.

Now, as Mikhail Gorbachev, or whatever authority presently governs the Soviet Union, commands Lithuania's submission to Soviet central authority, "old thinking" appears to be ascendant in Kremlin councils. To rationalize their tyranny, the Soviets present a familiar face to the West. Dour Kremlin ministers excuse their actions with time worn, specious arguments and despicable calumny. To restore order; in fraternal solidarity with the Lithuanian people; an effort to protect public safety—these are the lies upon which Soviet tyranny is again supported.

With 14 dead and counting in the siege of Vilnius, Gorbachev claims he is innocent of directing this crime. His protestations would ring truer were he to respond to the tragedy with anything other than criticism for the leaders of Lithuania's democratically elected government. Let him make clear his innocence by putting an end to this carnage and this tyranny now. Let him make clear his commitment to glasnost and perestroika by recognizing the Baltic States' right to self-determination.

It is the responsibility of the United States and the rest of the free world to make clear to the Soviets what they have risked in their resort to familiar practices of violent repression. The Soviet Union's status as a responsible member of the international community; the prospects for Soviet economic modernization; the termination of cold war hostilities—all are risked by this reckless return to the Brezhnev doctrine.

Clearly, Mr. President, the demise of "new thinking" in the Soviet Union should chill the sunny optimism of advocates for a build down of American defenses. The United States can ill afford to rely on Soviet promises of nonaggression while the resort to force in the Baltics is blamed on the political ascendancy of the Soviet military.

Like the leaders of Russia's former colonies in Eastern Europe, like some Russian leaders, and like the brave citizens of the Baltic States themselves, the United States must be outspoken in our condemnation of the attack on Lithuania. President Bush has firmly denounced Moscow's actions. Now is the time to emphatically state the costs that the Soviets will incur by continuing this aggression.

The disbursement of \$1 billion in agricultural commodity credit guarantees should be halted, especially in light of Moscow's threat to withhold U.S. grain from areas that did not cooperate with the Kremlin. Neither should U.S. Export-Import Bank coverage and credit guarantees, nor U.S. assistance in securing associate membership status in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank be provided the Soviets until they cease

using force to impose their control over the Baltics.

Mr. President, we should also make clear to the Kremlin leaders that our trust in their good faith is so seriously undermined by their aggression in the Baltics that we cannot consider jeopardizing Western security by providing technical assistance to the strategic Soviet energy sector or liberalizing technology transfers. Of course, a Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty would be a certain casualty to a sustained Soviet attack on the sovereignty of the Baltic States.

The United States should not restrain our opposition to that attack out of desire for Soviet cooperation in the Persian Gulf crisis. We should not expect Lithuania to forbear claiming her freedom until we restore freedom to Kuwait. Lithuania should not care if her declaration of independence is considered impolitic or inopportune by the governments of other nations. Lithuania need not schedule the restoration of her freedom to serve the political, diplomatic or security purposes of other nations. Why should she?

If the United States had been occupied by a foreign power for 50 years would we be restrained in our efforts to regain our sovereignty? Would we defer to the objections of other nations or of the occupying power once we had recognized our opportunity to be free? No, Americans would seize that opportunity the moment we glimpsed it, and no counsel for patience, no argument for caution, no dire warning, no power on earth would deter us.

Mr. President, let us commend Lithuanians for the courage they have shown. Let us pray for their deliverance from this aggression. Freedom is for the brave. Let brave Lithuania have hers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator BYRD in offering this resolution.

I suspect that I speak for both of us in saying: I wish we could do more than this resolution—I know he has been working hard on that side of the aisle to produce a resolution that would exert even more directly the economic leverage that we have over Moscow. I commend him for his efforts.

But Senator BYRD and I share this view: We must do something, now.

We must let the Soviet Union know, now, that the Congress will not tolerate an old order reaction in the Baltics—even while our main attention is focused on a new order test of resolve in the Persian Gulf.

We will not tolerate unknown and unnamed Kremlin apparat implementing a neo-Stalinist crackdown in the Baltics—while we practice business as usual with Gorbachev in Moscow.

Mr. President, in launching its crackdown in the Baltics, I'm sure the Krem-

lin has banked on the fact that all eyes are focused on the Persian Gulf. I'm sure the Kremlin has reasoned that—with so much on the line in the gulf—we will not be inclined to rock the boat in United States-Soviet relations.

Mr. President, let no one misread where America stands, either in the Persian Gulf or in the Baltics.

There may be a line in the sand in Saudi Arabia—but there is no line which divides the principles at issue in the gulf, and in the Baltics. Indeed, there is a line of reasoning, or principle, which brings them together.

For what is on the line in the gulf is whether America will tolerate the brutal repression by a powerful and ruthless nation against a small and defenseless neighbor.

And what is on the line in the Baltics is, on the bottom line, exactly the same thing.

Explicitly and implicitly, we have struck a deal with Moscow.

We have agreed to a new structure of United States-Soviet relations not because we think Gorbachev is a great guy, but because we have perceived—and have been led to believe—that there is a new character to Soviet policies, at home and abroad. Those new relations serve American interests, and the interests of international stability and peace. We have come to believe that the Soviet power structure—not out of some new-born altruism, but the same old self-interest that guides all nations—has come to understand that it cannot prosper, or perhaps even survive, by pursuing the old order, Stalinist style of politics and policies.

Our fundamental commitment is not to Gorbachev—but to the reformist policies he has been espousing and implementing.

If he turns his back on those policies—the deal is off. That is the simple and strong message of this resolution.

Mr. President, President Gorbachev cannot construct a bubble around the Soviet Union and the Baltics, and—inside that bubble—cannot turn back the clock to the era of Stalin; and somehow think that will not affect United States-Soviet relations. It won't work in the Baltics. It will not wash in the Congress.

Mr. President, I urge that we send that message, strong and clear, to Moscow—by passing this resolution.

Mr. President, I indicated in December we ought to review what we are doing with the Soviet Union because of their actions, or at that point not actions but threats and more recently actions with 15 Lithuanians killed. I have said that we should suspend export credits. That is not the universal position in the State of Kansas which exports a lot of grain. But as I said before, farmers are not blood merchants and farmers understand human rights and human rights abuses and they understand that hopefully this signal will

correct some of these problems. If Mr. Gorbachev did not know and if he now takes action to find out who perpetrated the acts of brutality and does not attempt to destroy democracy, then we will have made some progress.

Whether or not this resolution will have a direct impact, no one knows. But at least it is a strong bipartisan statement from the Senate which I believe will have an impact.

It is important that our friends and our allies and others who have offered credits and trade and other benefits to the Soviet Union do the same as we do. Otherwise, our producers are going to lose and their producers are going to gain. I think that is the one area that does properly concern American producers.

But morally we are on the right side, and I hope that our allies and the others will follow us in at least reviewing their credits and, if necessary, suspending credits until such time as the actions taken in this resolution have been complied with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to restate what I have said on this Senate floor on previous occasions during the past few days.

The consequences of the course of action now being pursued by the Soviet leadership are grave as they affect United States-Soviet relations. From time to time, those who are so affected by changes in U.S. policy contend that they were not aware in advance of what those consequences would be. There has been a great deal of debate and discussion, for example, about the events immediately preceding Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and whether or not that had any effect upon the invasion, the debate in the Senate, the position taken by the administration with respect to that debate on sanctions just prior to the invasion, and the now famous and controversial meeting between the United States Ambassador to Iraq and Saddam Hussein between the time of that debate and the invasion.

Whatever occurred there, this resolution following the one last week ought to make absolutely clear, and not subject to any misinterpretation by the Soviet leadership, that pursuing the current course of crackdown and repression in the Baltic States will have great consequences. No one will later be able to argue they did not understand what the consequences were. That is one reason and important reason for this resolution. Another is, of course, the reaffirmation of the principles in which we believe, by which we live, and which we advocate throughout the world.

So, Mr. President, I am pleased to join with our colleagues. I commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator

BYRD, for his leadership in this effort, as well as the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators DASCHLE and DIXON be added as cosponsors to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRYAN). Without objection, that will be the order.

It appears to the Chair that there are no further Senators seeking recognition.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask unanimous consent that Senator AKAKA be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be the order.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 14) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 14

Whereas on January 7, the Soviet Defense Ministry announced the deployment of additional troops to the republics of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova (formerly Moldavia) and the Ukraine.

Whereas President Gorbachev has threatened to impose direct "presidential rule" on Lithuania in place of the democratically elected Government of Lithuania.

Whereas the peaceful resistance of the Lithuanian people has been met with brutal and violent actions by the Soviet armed forces.

Whereas on January 11, more than a dozen people were killed and over one hundred injured when Soviet troops stormed and took control of the Lithuanian Republic's radio and television station effectively cutting off the Lithuanian Government's chief means of communication with the Lithuanian people.

Whereas the United States has never recognized the forcible annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

Whereas the United States Government has repeatedly communicated to President Gorbachev that the use of force in the Baltic States could seriously jeopardize United States-Soviet relations; Now, therefore, to it Resolved, That it is the Sense of the Senate that,

SECTION 1. The President should (i) immediately review all economic benefits provided by the United States Government to the Soviet Union, (ii) expeditiously report to the Congress on whether those benefits should be suspended in light of Soviet actions in the Baltic States, (iii) immediately suspend all ongoing technical exchanges, (iv) consider withdrawing United States support for Soviet membership in the IMF, World Bank or GATT, and (v) not proceed with the provision of MFN trade treatment until the following events have occurred:

(a) Soviet troops refrain from obstructing the functioning of the democratic governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

(b) The troops that were deployed following the January 7 announcement by the Soviet Defense Ministry are withdrawn;

(c) Soviet authorities cease their interference with the telecommunications, print, and other media in these states;

(d) Good-faith negotiations between the democratically elected governments of the Baltic States and the Soviet Union on the

restoration of the sovereignty of those states have begun;

(e) Concrete assurances are received from President Gorbachev that grain purchased with United States credits will not be used to coerce the Baltic States, or any republic of the Soviet Union, to sign the Union Treaty.

SEC. 2. The United States should consult with and encourage our allies to follow a policy similar to that outlined in section 1.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

BALTIC CRISIS

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, on May 11, 1940, the New York Herald Tribune announced that Hitler had invaded France—a small item on the bottom of the page noted that Red army troops had marched into the independent Baltic States.

Today, while the world's attention is turned to the crisis in Iraq, the Soviet Union is cynically taking advantage of the situation to crack down on Lithuania. This action is reminiscent of the Soviet Union of the cold war—of a Soviet Union which crushed Hungary while the United States and the West were preoccupied with the Suez Canal crisis—of a Soviet Union which snuffed out the Prague spring while the United States was consumed with the Vietnam conflict.

It is difficult to accept Mr. Gorbachev's excuse that he did not order the military action of the weekend. If this is so, we have to ask why he sent troops there in the first place. We have to ask why he has not yet condemned the action. We have to ask why he has not taken immediate steps to withdraw his troops and why they have taken over yet another Lithuanian Government building.

Mr. President, regrettably we also have to ask why it has taken the administration so long to react to Gorbachev's growing hardline position with respect to the Baltics. I am encouraged, however, that the President is finally speaking out forcefully.

I understand the President is reconsidering the summit. Several days ago, I wrote to President Bush to postpone the summit and to advise Mr. Gorbachev that United States-Soviet relations will not proceed on a business-as-usual course.

The Helsinki Commission, which I cochair with Congressman STENY HOYER, has written to the President asking that he take immediate steps to repeal the ill-timed partial waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. I also believe that we should cancel the extension of any commercial and commodity credits. On January 9, the Soviet Union began drawing on our agri-

cultural credits by placing orders of \$800 million for soybeans and corn.

I call on the President to immediately revoke these credits and to let Mr. Gorbachev know loudly and clearly that there will be no improvement in our economic relations while he is flagrantly violating the human rights of his own people.

The Helsinki Commission has also recommended to the President that a high level, bipartisan mission from both the executive and congressional branches be immediately dispatched to the Baltics to assure them of our support.

Further, we are urging the President to instruct our United States delegations to raise this issue in the strongest possible terms at the meetings of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe [CSCE] currently being held in Vienna, Austria, and Valletta, Malta. CSCE mechanisms designed to create dialogs on unusual military and human rights activities should be activated immediately.

Mr. President, Mr. Gorbachev was recently awarded the Nobel Peace prize for his leadership in reversing the cold war and setting the forces of democracy in motion in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. It is ironic, however, that while he has allowed the peoples of Eastern Europe to find their own way back to democracy he does not seem to be able to let the citizens of the Soviet Union and the Baltic States do the same.

It is time for the United States to stop paying lip service to our policy on nonrecognition and take a principled stand with respect to the Baltics. Lithuania, which held the first free and multiparty elections under Soviet power, moved quickly in March 1990 to declare the independence of its country. Mistakenly, as it turned out and, in my view, to the shame of the West, the Lithuanians believed that their action would be followed by support and recognition from at least the United States. Before any more blood is shed, now is the time for the United States to recognize, at long last, the independence of the Baltics.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

THE KILLING OF U.S. SOLDIERS IN EL SALVADOR UNDERLINES THE NECESSITY OF BRINGING AN END TO THE CIVIL WAR, NOT CONTINUING IT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, while I deplore the tragic deaths of three United States servicemen in El Salvador, with the reported evidence that two of the deaths were murders and were the result of deliberate wounds to the head by FMLN guerrillas, I also believe that the incident underlines that we must continue to follow the policy that the Congress overwhelmingly approved last fall and work for an end to the civil war. We must not let this horrible act deter us from supporting the peace process and from working for the improvement of the political and social justice system in El Salvador.

Indications are that the administration, fueled by this incident as well as by recent FMLN military activity, is preparing to formally call for the resumption of the military assistance that was withheld as a result of congressional action a few months ago. The release of these funds will not, I believe, serve the cause of peace. Likewise, to the FMLN, I say that their recent actions, especially the heinous crime committed by their fighters, has damaged their own cause and certainly damaged the chances for peace. The FMLN should demonstrate its commitment to peace by bringing to justice and severely punishing those who were involved in the murder of the American soldiers.

This terrible deed has overshadowed the fact that the peace talks are continuing in Mexico City under U.N. auspices. Providing the rest of the military aid will undermine the peace process and send the wrong signal to the Salvadoran military. It will undo the support that we in the Congress have given to those in El Salvador who want to bring real peace and justice to the Salvadoran people.

In the face of this crime, I am distressed also by the setback in the Jesuit case given the resignation of the two principal prosecutors because of interference from the Attorney General's office. We surely should not be releasing the funds in light of the problems that still persist in the resolution of the case of the murders of the priests.

The recent fighting and the tragic killing of the American soldiers should serve to invigorate our efforts to support the process which will end the bloody civil war. The military aid in question should not be restored.

I yield the floor.

TERRY ANDERSON

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to inform my colleagues that today marks the 2,132d day that Terry Anderson has been held captive in Lebanon.

On Sunday, Parade magazine featured an ABC television movie, "Held Hostage: The Sis and Jerry Levin Story." Michael Ryan writes of the Levins' remarkable courage. Of their commitment to communication and mutual understanding. Of their commitment to bringing the other hostages home.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt "Lest We Forget," from the above mentioned article, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Parade Magazine, Jan. 13, 1991]

LEST WE FORGET

The joy that Americans felt when Jerry Levin escaped from captivity was repeated last year, when hostages Frank Reed and Robert Polhill were freed after years of imprisonment in Lebanon. But for six American families—as well as for families in England, Italy and Germany—the agony of waiting still goes on. These are the Americans still being held as hostages in Lebanon:

TERRY ANDERSON

On March 16, 1985, the Associated Press bureau chief in Beirut was taken captive by the Islamic Jihad, a radical group that threatened to keep him until some Arabs imprisoned for terrorism in Kuwait were released. They recently made new demands. Anderson, now 43, has been held prisoner longer than any other Westerner, despite vigorous public efforts by his sister, Peggy Say, and several journalists' groups.

THOMAS SUTHERLAND

The Dean of Agriculture at the American University of Beirut was taken on June 9, 1985, while driving from the Beirut airport to the university. Sutherland, 59, was born in Scotland but lived with his family in Fort Collins, Colo. He reportedly is being held with Anderson.

JOSEPH CICCIPPIO

An accountant from Pennsylvania, Cicippio, now 60, was the acting comptroller of the American University of Beirut when kidnapped from his campus apartment on Sept. 12, 1986. The stress of his captivity has hung heavily on his family: Last fall, Cicippio's 35-year-old son—who had made public pleas for his father's freedom—succumbed to a sudden heart attack.

EDWARD TRACY

The 59-year-old book salesman and children's book author from Vermont was abducted Oct. 21, 1986. The Revolutionary Justice Organization—one of many groups responsible for hostage-takings in Beirut—claims to be holding him.

ALANN STEEN

Now 51, this journalism professor at Beirut University College was kidnapped Jan. 24, 1987, by the Islamic Jihad for the Liberation of Palestine. Captivity did not break his spirit, at least at first. He made an escape attempt that almost succeeded—then local residents turned him in to his kidnappers.

JESSE TURNER

The 43-year-old mathematician from Beirut University College was taken on the same day as Steen. They reportedly are held together. His 3-year-old daughter, Joanne, lives with Turner's wife at his mother's home in Boise, Idaho. She has never seen her father—although he may have seen her last

October at a children's party which was videotaped and broadcast in Lebanon.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 100-494, the Speaker appoints Mr. Alexander to the U.S. Alternative Fuels Councils on the part of the House; and the minority leader appoints Mr. Lewis of California to the aforesaid Council.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. FORD (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 220. A bill to establish a research and demonstration program to promote cofiring of natural gas and coal in certain boilers and to provide Federal funding to carry out the program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GLENN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 221. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to authorize members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States under arduous conditions pursuant to an assignment or duty detail as a part of Operation Desert Shield to participate in a saving program for members of the Armed Forces assigned for permanent duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAMM (for himself, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. BENTSEN):

S. 222. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants (in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense) for the establishment of research centers at qualifying medical schools to carry out medical research in areas of interest to the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 223. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to extend eligibility for reimbursement for meal supplements for children in afterschool care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

S. 224. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to modify the criteria for determining whether a private organization providing nonresidential day care services is considered an institution under the child care food program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 225. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park, VA; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. INOUE (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 226. A bill to recognize the organization known as the National Academies of Practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 227. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to establish a scholarship program to enable professional nurses to obtain advanced degrees in professions related to the practice of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. GRAMM:

S.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to Federal budget procedures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. WALLOP):

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution expressing the support of the United States for the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate May 1991 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. SIMON, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. HELMS, Mr. D'AMATO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. EXON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MACK, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COATS, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. GORE, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. REID, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ROBB, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. DURENBERGER, and Mr. AKAKA):

S. Res. 14. Resolution to express the sense of the Senate that the President should review economic benefits provided to the Soviet Union in light of the crisis in the Baltic States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding policy on underground nuclear explosions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FORD (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 220. A bill to establish a research and demonstration program to promote cofiring of natural gas and coal in certain boilers and to provide Federal funding to carry out the programs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

COFIRING PROMOTION ACT

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator BINGAMAN and myself, I am pleased to introduce the Cofiring Pro-

motion Act of 1991, legislation which I believe will make a major contribution toward alleviating an important environmental concern while at the same time preserving the jobs of coal miners in my State and elsewhere in the coal fields.

What we are talking about is establishing a meaningful research and development program to promote the simultaneous combustion, or cofiring, of two of our country's greatest fuel resources—coal and natural gas.

Although some cofiring research has taken place as part of the Department of Energy's clean coal technology program, a much more focused effort should be made by the Government and the private sector as early as possible. It is time to step up the research and provide the incentives to get this technology into the market place.

Mr. President, cofiring is a modest portion of the current DOE clean coal technology program. In fact, five projects have been selected for DOE funding, one each in Ohio and Indiana and three in Illinois, to test various methods of cofiring natural gas with coal in different types of utility boilers. This technology combines the clean burning characteristics of natural gas with the attractive economics of existing base load coal powerplants. For certain types of boilers, combined coal-natural gas technologies may be the only practical method of achieving substantial sulfur dioxide [SO₂] and nitrogen oxide [NO_x] reductions.

What we need to do is expand and emphasize this program. This legislation will accomplish this result.

Without being too technical, the cofiring of natural gas with coal can be divided into three separate categories: First, basic cofiring; second, natural gas reburn; and third, reburn with sorbent injection. Let me briefly describe each technology and its benefits.

First, simple cofiring of natural gas with coal involves the injection of gas into the boiler to provide a fraction of its total heat input. Originally, it was thought that this technique would reduce the amount of SO₂ and NO_x emissions in the same proportion that gas was used in the boiler. However, recent experience with Duquesne Light Co.'s Cheswick power station in Pennsylvania found that even greater than proportional reductions of SO₂ occurred. That test, which involved a 570 megawatt tangentially-fired boiler, found that cofiring 1 to 3 percent gas could obtain SO₂ reductions of approximately 3 to 10 percent. Similarly, 6 to 12 percent gas cofiring could reduce NO_x by 10 to 15 percent.

Second, reburn technology is aimed at reducing powerplant NO_x emissions. It also involved using gas as a small portion of the boiler fuel, but unlike basic cofiring, reburn technology involves injecting that fuel into a zone beyond the primary combustion zone

to create a natural gas rich reburn zone. Over-fire air is added in the final burnout zone to complete the overall combustion process. In this reburn zone, much of the NO_x present is converted to elemental nitrogen. Pilot tests indicate that a majority of cyclone boilers could successfully apply this technology in order to reduce their NO_x emissions by approximately 60 percent. It is particularly significant that reburn technology is effective in reducing emissions from cyclone boilers, as no commercially demonstrated combustion modification technique exists for these boilers.

Third, gas reburn with sorbent injection refers to combining reburn techniques with the injection of dry calcium-based sorbent in the over-fire air area of the boiler to reduce SO_2 emissions. This method of sorbent injections avoids the cost and complexity of other systems of sorbent injection, improves sorbent utilization, and reduces the amounts of sorbent required. Using a 15 to 20 percent proportion of natural gas in a reburn-sorbent injection configuration can achieve the NO_x reductions cited above and also reduce SO_2 emissions by 50 percent.

The economics of using a particular natural gas cofiring technology at any given utility facility depend on various factors, including capacity, technical options, age of the plant, capacity factors, the sulfur content of the coal used, and the availability of gas.

One reason that cofiring is so promising is that the top 100 SO_2 emitting powerplants are an average of 5 miles from a natural gas pipeline, and sometimes are that close to two or more pipelines.

Mr. President, I made reference to the positive impact a successful cofiring technology could have on both the natural gas and coal industries if it is brought to the marketplace. We know undoubtedly that the recently enacted Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 is going to impact today's utility industry and adversely affect employment in the high sulfur coal industry. We need to do all we can to minimize the economic dislocation that the new regulatory regime would impose.

Cofiring could, in many instances, actually help protect certain mining jobs that might otherwise be in jeopardy.

Faced with the need to reduce emissions from existing plants, utilities can choose to install a scrubber, switch to low sulfur coal, or cofire. Undoubtedly, the scrubber option will preserve current coal industry employment patterns by allowing plants to continue using the current coal supplies. But for many plants, scrubbers may be impractical—scrubber economics will be less favorable for older and smaller plants. In other cases, plants may not have the physical space for a scrubber, or an operator may need to achieve NO_x reduc-

tions in addition to SO_2 reductions. In these instances, the choice is between fuel switching, plant output reductions, and cofiring. Given these alternatives, cofiring preserves jobs by allowing plants to remain in normal operation and use current coal supplies.

A significant number of plants could be in this situation. While it is difficult to determine with precision the thresholds beyond which scrubbing becomes impractical, there are 550 boiler units under 300 MW in size and over 30 years of age. These 550 plants burn 84 million tons of coal annually which, based on industry employment indices, would support the employment of 16,000 mine workers.

Thus, the employment impacts of cofiring must be viewed in light of the alternatives facing the utility. In many cases, cofiring may be the least disruptive and most economic option and may preserve jobs that would otherwise be lost.

By generating additional demand for natural gas, cofiring would also help stimulate additional employment opportunities in the gas production sector. An economic impact study done at Southern Methodist University assessed the impact of higher natural gas production in Texas on employment. The study found a potential gain of 22,614 new jobs in Texas from an increase of just 379 Bcf of natural gas production. Based on this relationship, the employment growth resulting from expanded gas demand of 200 Bcf to 750 Bcf would be 12,000 to 45,000 jobs.

Natural gas cofiring is one of the most promising and cost-effective near-term clean fuel technologies, especially for retrofitting existing coal-fired boilers. As I noted, several demonstration projects are currently being funded through DOE's Clean Coal Program, but this option should be given a higher priority within the Department and encouraged in the market place.

Senator BINGAMAN and I introduced an earlier version of this bill, S. 1848, the Natural Gas Cofiring Promotion Act of 1989, in the 101st Congress. That bill was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, was the subject of a hearing before the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development, and was reported by the committee as an amendment to S. 324, the National Energy Policy Act of 1990. S. 324 was passed by the Senate, but was not taken up by the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991 and a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

I urge my colleagues to join with Senator BINGAMAN and me in sponsoring the Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991. I am hopeful that our bill to promote cofiring will become law in the 102d Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 220

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress recognizes that—

- (a) coal is an enormous domestic resource;
- (b) certain harmful emissions from the combustion of coal will limit the percentage of the resource base which is deemed "usable";
- (c) natural gas is an abundant domestic resource that has superior environmental qualities;
- (d) certain technologies combine natural gas with coal in order to reduce sulfur dioxide (SO_2) and nitrogen oxide (NO_x) emissions, particulates and carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions from the combustion of coal; and improves the operating efficiency of some boilers by reducing slagging;
- (e) certain technologies offer the potential to extend the usable coal resource base in the United States; and
- (f) the United States will continue to rely on domestic coal as a primary fuel in electric generation. Therefore, it is in the national interest to encourage the utilization of those natural gas technologies that reduce SO_2 and NO_x emissions resulting from the combustion of coal.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act—

- (a) the term "cofiring" means the injection of natural gas and pulverized coal into the primary combustion zone of an electric utility or an industrial boiler and shall include gas return technologies;
- (b) the term "gas reburn" means the injection of natural gas into the upper furnace region of an electric utility or an industrial boiler to produce a fuel-rich zone thereby reducing nitrogen oxide emissions; and
- (c) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 4. RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) The Secretary shall establish and carry out a program of research, development and demonstration of cofiring in utility and large industrial boilers in order to determine optimal natural gas injection levels for both environmental and operational benefits.

(b) The Secretary shall provide financial assistance under this section to appropriate parties for the research, development and demonstration of cofiring technologies.

(c) The Secretary shall not finance more than 50 per centum of the total costs of a cofiring technology project selected for financial assistance under this section as estimated by the Secretary as of the date of award of financial assistance.

(d) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not more than \$9,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994 for purposes of this section.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—THE COFIRING PROMOTION ACT OF 1991

Section 1: Short Title—The short title of this legislation is the Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991.

Section 2: Findings—It is found that it is in the national interest to encourage the utilization of natural gas cofiring technologies that reduce sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and nitrogen oxide (NO_x) emissions resulting from the combustion of coal.

Section 3: Definitions—the terms "cofiring," "gas reburn" and "Secretary" are defined for purposes of the legislation.

Section 4: Research and Demonstration Programs—

Subsection (a): The Secretary of Energy is authorized to carry out a research, development and demonstration program to determine optimal natural gas cofiring levels for environmental and operational benefits in electric utility and large industrial boilers.

Subsection (b): The Secretary of Energy shall provide financial assistance for the research, development and demonstration of cofiring technologies.

Subsection (c): The Secretary of Energy shall not finance more than 50 percent of the cost of a cofiring technology project selected for financial assistance.

Subsection (d): Not more than \$9 million is authorized to be appropriated in each of fiscal years 1992, and 1993 and 1994 for the purposes of this section.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to join with my distinguished colleague from Kentucky, Senator FORD in introducing the Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991, legislation that will provide incentives for the demonstration and deployment of natural gas cofiring technologies. I introduced identical legislation last session.

Natural gas is our Nation's cleanest fossil fuel. Its combustion emits virtually no particulates, sulfur oxides or reactive hydrocarbons, and it produces far lower emissions of nitrogen oxides per unit of energy than oil or coal. Natural gas produces only about half as much carbon dioxide per unit of energy as coal. What this adds up to is that natural gas can play an important part in achieving the emissions reductions required under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

As one of the Nation's top producing States of both natural gas and low-sulfur coal, New Mexico is in a unique position to help meet those national emissions reductions.

Cofiring refers to burning natural gas and coal together in the primary combustion zone of the same boiler. Basic natural gas cofiring involves the injection of natural gas with pulverized coal into the primary combustion zone of a boiler. Since natural gas contains virtually no sulfur or nitrogen, its substitution for a certain percentage of coal will naturally reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide [SO₂] and oxides of nitrogen [NO_x]. These two air pollutants are the precursors of acid rain. Tests have indicated that cofiring is potentially one of the most cost-effective ways to reduce SO₂ and NO_x emissions.

At Duquesne Light Co.'s Cheswick Power Plant, north of Pittsburgh, a demonstration program documented a 25 percent reduction of NO_x emissions using 6 to 10 percent natural gas cofiring. The program also documented

greater than proportional reductions of SO₂ emissions under certain operating conditions. Clearly, this technology is worth pursuing.

In addition to SO₂ and NO_x emissions reductions, cofiring offers other advantages. First, cofiring offers a substantial number of operating flexibilities and efficiencies for electric utility and industrial coal plants and can help old plants operate at or near their rated capacities. Second, using natural gas in coal boilers can widen the range of coals that can be burned. Third, all of this can be accomplished at a very low capital cost and with virtually no technological risk.

In the context of compliance with the Clean Air Act amendments, basic cofiring can be an important bridge technology. Basic cofiring promises to be a cost effective means for electric utilities with older coal burning plants to achieve emissions reductions during the period preceding the commercial availability of innovative clean coal technologies. Without cofiring, electric utilities will be left with the choice between phasing out still useful old powerplants or making exceptionally large capital investments in retrofitting such plants with scrubbers.

Furthermore, cofiring might actually help to preserve mining jobs by making it possible for utilities to continue to burn high-sulfur coal. In many instances, scrubbers may be impractical. Cofiring will make it possible for electric utilities to continue to use their existing coal supplier when a powerplant would otherwise be forced to switch to low-sulfur coal, reduce output, or even close.

Advanced natural gas cofiring technologies promise to achieve even greater emissions reductions at low capital cost. These technologies are known as gas reburn technologies. This term refers to the injection of natural gas into the upper furnace region of a boiler to produce a fuel-rich zone that reduces NO_x. Tests indicate that 20 percent natural gas cofiring in a reburn application can reduce NO_x emissions by 60 percent and SO₂ emissions by 20 percent. When mated with sorbent injection technology, gas reburn can produce a 50-percent reduction in SO₂ emissions. A demonstration project using gas reburn with in-duct sorbent injection was selected for Federal cost sharing as part of the first round of the Department of Energy's Clean Coal Technology Program.

While basic cofiring technology is commercially available, further testing and full-scale demonstrations are needed. Some of the questions that remain to be answered include:

What is the optimal level of natural gas injection to achieve the maximum environmental and operational benefits of cofiring?

What influence might the use of different boiler types or different coal

types have upon the effectiveness of cofiring?

In short, what is needed is a program to obtain critical operating data to define the optimum conditions for using cofiring to reduce emissions. This data will enable utilities and large industrial boiler operators to proceed with confidence in retrofitting their existing coal-fired boilers to accept cofiring.

The Natural Gas Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991 establishes just such a program. This legislation authorizes the Secretary of Energy to administer a 3-year, \$27 million program for the research, development, and demonstration of cofiring technologies. These Federal funds would be available on a cost-sharing basis, whereby project sponsors would be required to provide no less than 50 percent of project funding from non-Federal sources.

The proposed level of funding should be enough to fund on a cost-sharing basis five separate cofiring demonstrations over a 3-year period. This could include three field evaluations of basic cofiring technology, one each in the three basic types of coal-fired boilers—tangential, wall-fired, and cyclone boilers—and two demonstrations of advanced natural gas reburn technologies.

In closing, cofiring technology has demonstrated great promise. The legislation that Senator FORD and I have introduced today is a modest measure that will help to ensure that this technology will live up to its promise when the time comes for compliance with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. I urge my colleagues to join Senator FORD and me in sponsoring the Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991.

By Mr. GLENN (for himself and Mr. McCain):

S. 221. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to authorize members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States under arduous conditions pursuant to an assignment or duty detail as a part of Operation Desert Shield to participate in a savings program for members of the Armed Forces assigned for permanent duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The remarks of Mr. GLENN on this legislation appear earlier in today's RECORD.)

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. 223. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to extend eligibility for reimbursement for meal supplements for children in afterschool care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

CHILD NUTRITION ASSISTANCE

● Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, because of a growing number of dual-career and single parent families, there is an increasing need for child care. In 1968, Congress began the Child Care

Food Program [CCFP] as an addition to the National School Lunch Act. Authorized under Section 17 of the National School Lunch Act, the Child Care Food Program provides funds for food service to children in child care centers and family and group day care homes.

This has been an enormously successful and popular program presently serving over 1 million children. Major scientific studies have proven that children who participate in the CCFP benefit nutritionally. Furthermore, CCFP is the only Federal program which establishes nutrition standards for meals served to preschool children in family day care. CCFP along with other child nutrition programs are not only nutritionally beneficial but also economically beneficial. According to the Committee for Economic Development every dollar spent in early intervention saves \$5 in remedial education, welfare, and crime control.

Mr. President, I believe that my colleagues will agree it is of utmost importance to ensure that our Nation's children receive proper nutrition. Unfortunately, certain inequities exist that prevent this from happening. The CCFP authorizes Federal funding for an afternoon snack in an approved child care facility. However, a complicated maze of regulations makes it difficult for a school to become an approved child care facility eligible for reimbursement of a meal supplement. Under these rules, in Kentucky, only one school would qualify for this reimbursement.

When the school day is over, a child has three options; go home, go to a child care facility or stay at school. While going home to parental supervision is the best option, many do not have a choice because of working parents. Currently, there are schools that provide after school child care from 2:30 to 6 p.m. Many schools provide a snack, however, they receive no Federal reimbursement. Public schools have both the classroom space and educational materials needed for child care. It does not make sense to close the doors as soon as the final bell rings. For this reason, I am introducing a bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to extend eligibility for reimbursement for meal supplements for children in after school care.

However, much more can be done. In this wealthy and prosperous Nation, it is an unacceptable tragedy that thousands of children are forced to go hungry. It is my intention that the legislation I am introducing today will further provide and enhance children's academic ability. By continuing these programs to furnish children with a steady, solid diet, we improve their performance in school, keep them healthy, and ultimately give them the chance they deserve to succeed in life.●

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. 224. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to modify the criteria for determining whether a private organization providing nonresidential day care services is considered an institution under the Child Care Food Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

ELIGIBILITY UNDER THE CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM

● Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, we have no greater responsibility than ensuring the health and well-being of our Nation's children. Meeting this responsibility is for me the most rewarding and inspirational part of public service. That is why I take great pleasure today in introducing legislation which will benefit millions of children nationwide, by providing them with nutritious meals.

The bill I am introducing today helps needy children and child care centers by changing the eligibility criteria for participation in the Child Care Food Program. Presently, participation is based on the number of title XX funded slots in a center. This discriminates against many States, particularly in the South, where there is a shortage of title XX funds available for child care. To better serve needy children, my bill bases eligibility for child care food benefits on the number of children who qualify for free or reduced priced meals under the National School Lunch Act.

Currently, a demonstration project of this nature is being conducted in Kentucky. Early figures show that the number of children receiving benefits of the Child Care Food Program under the new eligibility requirements for center participation to be rising. We should now be willing to offer these benefits to children in each and every one of the 50 states.

Mr. President, it is time that we focus on the needs of America's children. My hope is that all children will gain from this action, not only in physical well-being, but also in learning ability.●

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 225. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park, VA; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXPANSION OF FREDERICKSBURG AND SPOTSYLVANIA COUNTY BATTLEFIELDS MEMORIAL NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to include land that is historically significant to the Civil War Battle of the Wilderness within the boundaries of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park. The same bill has been introduced by my colleague in the

House of Representatives, Congressman FRENCH SLAUGHTER.

Mr. President, my colleagues in the Senate will recall that in 1988, they approved legislation later enacted into law authorizing the National Park Service to purchase 762 acres of private land and 593 acres in scenic easements for the expansion of the military park. In enacting this legislation, Congress recognized the significance of the Fredericksburg-Spotsylvania area. Four important Civil War battles occurred in this area on the way to the pivotal Battle of Richmond: Those of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Wilderness, and Spotsylvania Court House.

The Confederate Army achieved substantial gains during both the battles of Fredericksburg, in December 1862, and Chancellorsville, in April 1863. The Chancellorsville engagement, however, was costly to the Confederate Army because of the loss of the famed Gen. Stonewall Jackson. During the battles of Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House both in May 1864, General Grant succeeded in pushing Lee closer to Richmond, despite significant Union losses. Although these two battles are viewed by historians as Confederate gains, they mark the beginning of a long campaign in which the Federal army under U.S. Grant ultimately gained its objectives.

The bill I am introducing is designed to foster the preservation and interpretation of Longstreet's flank attack at Wilderness Battlefield. The site is currently owned by a private developer and slated for housing construction. The landowner has now indicated that he is interested in working with the National Park Service, Spotsylvania County officials, and private preservation groups to reach an agreement on the protection of this site. Secretary of Interior Lujan's plan to encourage public-private partnerships to protect battlefields, has expressed support for purchase of land, as the first test of his plan.

At this time, discussions among interested groups have yielded a plan for a private preservation group to purchase the land from the developer and hold it until the Department of Interior is able to purchase the land or until such time as it may be donated to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I was pleased to be part of the legislative initiatives last Congress which established the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission and the 1-year Shenandoah Valley Civil War sites study.

While the mission of the Shenandoah Valley study is to identify those endangered sites and to provide the Congress with recommendations for preserving and interpreting these sites, it is critical to move forward with the expansion of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park at this time.

There is universal recognition that significant events occurred on this site. The landowner is anxious to reach an equitable agreement to preserve the property and local preservation groups are aggressively pursuing private fundraising efforts so this site can serve as a model for implementing Secretary Lujan's American battlefield protection plan.*

By Mr. INOUE (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 226. A bill to recognize the organization known as the National Academies of Practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF PRACTICE

• Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation which would provide a Federal charter for the National Academies of Practice. This organization represents outstanding practitioners who have made significant contributions to the practice of applied psychology, dentistry, medicine, nursing, optometry, osteopathy, podiatry, social work, and veterinary medicine. When fully established, each of the nine academies will possess 100 distinguished practitioners selected by their peers. This umbrella organization will be able to provide the Congress of the United States and the executive branch with considerable health policy expertise, especially from the perspective of those individuals who are in the forefront of actually providing health care.

Mr. President, as we continue to grapple with the many complex issues surrounding the delivery of health care services, it is clearly in our best interest to ensure that the Congress have systematic access to the recommendations of an interdisciplinary body of health care practitioners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 226

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

CHARTER

SECTION 1. The National Academies of Practice organized and incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia, is hereby recognized as such and is granted a charter.

POWERS

SEC. 2. The National Academies of Practice (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation") shall have only those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State or States in which it is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State or States.

PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be to honor persons who have made significant contributions to the practice of ap-

plied psychology, dentistry, medicine, social work, veterinary medicine, and other health care professions, and to improve the practices in these professions by disseminating information about new techniques and procedures.

SERVICE OF PROCESS

SEC. 4. With respect to service of process, the corporation shall comply with the laws of the States in which it is incorporated and those States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall be as provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 6. The board of directors of the corporation and the responsibilities thereof shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

OFFICERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 7. The officers of the corporation, and the election of such officers shall be as is provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director of the corporation or be distributed to any such person during the life of this charter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) The corporation shall not make any loan to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation.

(c) The corporation and any officer and director of the corporation, acting as such officer or director, shall not contribute to, support or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

(d) The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

(e) The corporation shall not claim congressional approval or Federal Government authority for any of its activities.

LIABILITY

SEC. 9. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 10. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of any proceeding of the corporation involving any of its members, the board of directors, or any committee having authority under the board of directors. The corporation shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of all members having the right of vote. All books and records of such corporation may be inspected by any member having the right to vote, or by any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time. Nothing in this section shall be construed to contravene any applicable State law.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 11. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1101), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (72) as paragraph (71);

(2) by designating the paragraph relating to the Non Commissioned Officers Association of the United States of America, Incorporated, as paragraph (72);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (60), relating to the National Mining Hall of Fame and Museum, as paragraph (73); and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(75) National Academies of Practice."

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 12. The corporation shall report annually to the Congress concerning the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. Such annual report shall be submitted at the same time as is the report of the audit for such fiscal year required by section 3 of the Act referred to in section 11 of this Act. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this charter is expressly reserved to the Congress.

DEFINITION OF "STATE"

SEC. 14. For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS

SEC. 15. The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation as provided in the Internal Revenue Code.

TERMINATION

SEC. 16. If the corporation shall fail to comply with any of the restrictions or provisions of this Act the charter granted hereby shall terminate.*

By Mr. INOUE (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 227. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to establish a scholarship program to enable professional nurses to obtain advanced degrees in professions related to the practice of nursing; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

ADVANCED NURSE EDUCATION ACT

• Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today, together with Senator AKAKA, to provide special scholarships to professional nurses that wish to obtain an advanced degree in related fields such as law, public health, business administration, and psychology.

Mr. President, it is quite evident that our Nation faces a major nursing crisis. We believe that it is time to develop creative approaches to ensure the citizens of this Nation access to the highest quality health care possible. This legislation would allow nurses mobility within the health care field by providing them with the opportunity to obtain an advanced degree. We are con-

fidant that this will encourage other individuals to enter nursing as well as increase the number of professional nurses as well as increase the number of professional nurses being appointed to high-level health policy positions.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 227

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Advanced Nurse Education Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

Part B of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 297 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subpart:

"Subpart V—Advanced Education in Related Professions

"SEC. 848. SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a scholarship program to enable professional nurses to pursue master's and doctoral degrees in fields related to the practice of nursing.

"(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to participate in the scholarship program, an individual shall—

"(1) be accepted for enrollment, or be enrolled, as a full-time student in a course of study—

"(A) at an accredited educational institution in a State;

"(B) approved by the Secretary; and

"(C) leading to a master's degree or a doctoral degree in a field related to nursing;

"(2) submit an application to participate in the scholarship program; and

"(3) sign and submit to the Secretary, at the time of submission of the application referred to in paragraph (2), a written contract containing the information specified in subsection (d) to accept payment of a scholarship and to serve in accordance with this subpart for the applicable period of obligated service.

"(c) APPLICATION FORMS.—

"(1) CONTENTS.—In disseminating application forms and contract forms to individuals desiring to participate in the scholarship program, the Secretary shall include with the forms—

"(A) a fair summary of the rights and liabilities of an individual whose application is approved and whose contract is accepted by the Secretary, including in the summary a clear explanation of the damages to which the United States is entitled under section 848B in the case of breach of the contract by the individual; and

"(B) such other information as may be necessary for the individual to understand the prospective participation of the individual in the scholarship program and the service obligation of the individual.

"(2) CLARITY.—The application form, contract form, and all other information furnished by the Secretary under this subpart shall be written in a manner calculated to be understood by the average individual applying to participate in the scholarship program.

"(3) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the application forms, contract forms,

and other information available to individuals desiring to participate in the scholarship program on a date sufficiently early to ensure that the individuals have adequate time to carefully review and evaluate the forms and information.

"(d) CONTRACT.—The written contract between the Secretary and an individual shall contain—

"(1) a statement that the Secretary agrees, subject to paragraph (3), to provide the individual with a scholarship in each school year for a period of up to 7 years, as determined by the individual, during which period the individual is pursuing a course of study described in subsection (b)(1);

"(2) a statement that the individual agrees, subject to paragraph (3)—

"(A) to accept the provision of the scholarship to the individual;

"(B) to maintain enrollment in a course of study described in subsection (b)(1) until the individual completes the course of study;

"(C) that while enrolled in the course of study, the individual will maintain an acceptable level of academic standing (as determined under regulations of the Secretary by the educational institution offering the course of study); and

"(D) for a time period equal to 1 year for each school year for which the individual received a scholarship under the scholarship program, to serve in the full-time clinical practice of the profession of the individual, in—

"(i) a public or nonprofit private health care facility; or

"(ii) if approved by the Secretary, a private health care facility in a medically underserved area (as designated by the Secretary);

"(3) a provision that states that any financial obligation of the United States arising out of a contract entered into under this subpart and any obligation of the individual that is conditioned on the financial obligation, is contingent on funds being appropriated for scholarships under this subpart;

"(4) a statement of the damages to which the United States is entitled under section 848B for breach of the contract by the individual; and

"(5) other statements of the rights and liabilities of the Secretary and of the individual, not inconsistent with this subpart.

"(e) ACCEPTANCE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual shall become a participant in the scholarship program only on the approval by the Secretary of the application submitted by the individual under subsection (b)(2) and the acceptance by the Secretary of the contract submitted by the individual under subsection (b)(3).

"(2) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall provide written notice to an individual of participation in the scholarship program promptly on the acceptance of the individual into the program under paragraph (1).

"(f) SCHOLARSHIP.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A scholarship provided to an individual for a school year under subsection (d)(1) shall consist of—

"(A) payment to the individual, or on behalf of the individual in accordance with paragraph (2), of the amount of—

"(i) the tuition of the individual in the school year; and

"(ii) all other reasonable educational expenses, including fees, books, and laboratory expenses, incurred by the individual in the school year; and

"(B) payment to the individual of a stipend of \$400 per month, adjusted in accordance

with paragraph (3), for each of the 12 consecutive months beginning with the first month of the school year.

"(2) CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS.—The Secretary may contract with an educational institution in which a participant in the scholarship program is enrolled for the payment to the educational institution of the amounts of tuition and other reasonable educational expenses described in paragraph (1)(A). Payment to the educational institution may be made without regard to section 3324 of title 31, United States Code.

"(3) ADJUSTMENT OF STIPEND.—

"(A) TIMING.—The amount of the monthly stipend described in paragraph (1)(B) shall be increased by the Secretary for each school year ending in a fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1992.

"(B) AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall increase for a school year the amount of the monthly stipend described in paragraph (1)(B), as in effect during the preceding school year, by the amount obtained by—

"(i) multiplying the amount of the stipend by the overall percentage increase, if any, made in accordance with section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule for the fiscal year in which the school year begins; and

"(ii) rounding the result obtained after performing the multiplication described in clause (i) by rounding to the next highest multiple of \$1.

"SEC. 848A. OBLIGATED SERVICE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Each individual who has entered into a written contract with the Secretary under section 848 shall provide obligated service for the period of obligated service provided in the contract.

"(b) APPROVAL OF SERVICE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days prior to the date on which an individual described in subsection (a) is scheduled to complete the course of study for which the individual received a scholarship under the scholarship program, the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the position in which the individual proposes to provide the obligated service.

"(2) DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves the position described in paragraph (1), the individual shall, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary, arrange the provision of the service in another position approved by the Secretary.

"SEC. 848B. BREACH OF SCHOLARSHIP CONTRACT.

"(a) FAILURE TO COMPLETE ACADEMIC PROGRAM UNDER SCHOLARSHIP.—An individual who has entered into a written contract with the Secretary under section 848 shall be liable to the United States for the amount which has been paid to the individual, or on behalf of the individual, under the contract, in lieu of any service obligation arising under the contract if the individual—

"(1) fails to maintain an acceptable level of academic standing, as determined by the educational institution under regulations of the Secretary, in the educational institution in which the individual is enrolled;

"(2) is dismissed from the educational institution for disciplinary reasons;

"(3) voluntarily terminates the training in the educational institution for which the individual is provided a scholarship under the contract, before the completion of the training; or

"(4) fails to accept payment, or instructs the educational institution in which the individual is enrolled not to accept payment, in whole or in part, of a scholarship under the contract.

"(b) AMOUNT OF DAMAGES.—

"(1) FAILURE TO BEGIN OR COMPLETE SERVICE OBLIGATION.—Except as provided in subsection (c)(2), if for any reason not specified in subsection (a) an individual breaches a written contract entered into this subpart by failing either to begin the service obligation of the individual or to complete the service obligation, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the individual an amount determined in accordance with the formula

$$A=3\phi(t-s/t)$$

in which—

"(A) 'A' is the amount the United States is entitled to recover;

"(B) 'φ' is the sum of the amounts paid under this subpart to or on behalf of the individual and the interest on the amounts that would be payable if at the time the amounts were paid the amounts were loans bearing interest at the maximum legal prevailing rate, as determined by the Treasurer of the United States;

"(C) 't' is the total number of months in the period of obligated service of the individual; and

"(D) 's' is the number of months of the period served by the individual in accordance with section 848(d)(2)(D).

"(2) PAYMENT.—Any amount of damages that the United States is entitled to recover under this subsection shall be paid to the United States within the 1-year period beginning on the date of the breach of the written contract, or such longer period beginning on the date of the breach as is specified by the Secretary for good cause shown.

"(c) CANCELLATION, WAIVER, OR RELEASE.—

"(1) CANCELLATION.—Any obligation of an individual under the scholarship program, or a contract under the program, for service or payment of damages shall be cancelled on the death of the individual.

"(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary shall by regulation provide for the partial or total waiver or suspension of any obligation of service or payment by an individual under the scholarship program, or a contract under the program, whenever compliance by the individual is impossible or would involve extreme hardship to individual and if enforcement of the obligation with respect to any individual would be unconscionable.

"(3) RELEASE.—Any obligation of an individual under the scholarship program, or a contract under the program, for payment of damages may be released by a discharge in bankruptcy under title 11, United States Code, only if the discharge is granted after the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the first date that payment of the damages is required.

"SEC. 848C. DEFINITIONS.

"As used in this subpart:

"(1) FIELD RELATED TO NURSING.—The term 'field related to nursing' includes the fields of law, public health, and psychology, and fields determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

"(2) OBLIGATED SERVICE.—The term 'Obligated service' means the service described in section 848(d)(2)(D).

"(3) PERIOD OF OBLIGATED SERVICE.—The term 'period of obligated service' means the period described in section 848(D)(2)(D).

"(4) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—The term 'scholarship program' means the program established in section 848.

"SEC. 848D. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"To carry out this subpart, there are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for fis-

cal year 1992 and each of the subsequent fiscal year."*

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. WALLOP):

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution expressing the support of the United States for the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUPPORT FOR INDEPENDENCE OF THE BALTIC NATIONS

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, the tragic Soviet military assault on the Baltic people and their efforts to establish functioning democracies, which has left at least 15 civilians dead and over a hundred injured, must not go unanswered.

The United States, which for more than half a century has steadfastly refused to recognize Soviet illegal occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, has a responsibility to demonstrate its strong objection to the Soviet's use of force against the Baltic people. We have a further obligation to bring to bear what pressure we can on Soviet authorities to replace their armed aggression against the Baltic people with the peaceful negotiations repeatedly sought by the Baltic governments on issues regarding the restoration of their countries' independence.

That is why I am, today, along with Senators KERRY, DECONCINI, and WALLOP introducing legislation stating that, until the President certifies to the Congress that the Soviets have ceased their hostilities against the Baltic people, withdrawn their military forces from Baltic facilities and government buildings and initiated good-faith negotiations with the democratically elected Baltic governments, no United States consideration will be given to granting them most-favored-nation status, Eximbank insurance coverage and credit guarantees, membership in the IMF and World Bank or to waiving financing restrictions of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

In order to strengthen the hand of the democratically elected governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the President is directed to—

First, redirect any Commodity Credit Corporation agricultural credits, extended to the Soviet Union, away from the central Soviet Government and into the Baltic States and those Soviet Republics which are seeking such direct assistance;

Second, provide emergency medical assistance to the Baltic people channeled through appropriate private voluntary organizations; and

Third, ask that the issue of Soviet aggression against the Baltic people be raised in the United Nations.

Finally, this legislation urges the President to open closer diplomatic

ties with the democratically elected governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, to pave the way for official United States recognition of those governments.

Mr. President, as described in a lead article in today's New York Times which carries the headline: "Wider Crackdown Is Feared in Baltics," all indications are that the situation in the Baltic States will get worse before it gets better. The time is now for our Government to send the clear message to the Kremlin that its armed aggression against the Baltic people will do serious damage to United States-Soviet relations. President Bush has not sent that clear message. The Congress must.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, along with relevant articles from today's New York Times:

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 42

Whereas the United States has never recognized the illegal incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union;

Whereas the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States in 1940, like Iraq's annexation of Kuwait, is a blatant violation of international law;

Whereas in 1990, the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania held the first democratic elections in their countries since the Soviet annexation a half century earlier;

Whereas in those elections, the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania elected large majorities of candidates who supported the re-establishment of the independent, democratic Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

Whereas, despite their status under international law as occupied countries, the Baltic nations followed the procedures of Soviet law in order to elect democratic governments;

Whereas the Baltic nations have repeatedly sought to engage Soviet authorities in peaceful negotiations on the issues regarding the restoration or their independence;

Whereas Soviet President Gorbachev has threatened to impose direct 'Presidential Rule' on Lithuania unless the Lithuanian government repeals all of its laws and reinstates the Soviet constitution;

Whereas coalitions of pro-Moscow forces in all three Baltic countries have demanded the resignation of the democratically elected Baltic governments and threatened to establish themselves as alternative government bodies;

Whereas Soviet military actions in Lithuania over the past several days have left at least 14 civilians dead and more than 160 injured; and

Whereas Soviet troop movements have also occurred in the Baltic Republics of Estonia and Latvia, where several people have been injured in troop attacks by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' Interior Ministry on Latvian government facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it is the sense of the Congress that:

(1) the Government and the people of the United States strongly and unequivocally support the right of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to independence and democracy; and

(2) the Soviet Union should immediately cease all hostilities against the Baltic people, remove their troops from Baltic facilities and government buildings, and initiate good faith negotiations with the democratically elected Baltic governments regarding the restoration of the independence of the Baltic countries.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until such time as the President certifies to Congress that the Soviet Union has ceased all hostilities against the Baltic people, has removed all Soviet troops from Baltic facilities and government buildings, and has initiated good faith negotiations with democratically elected governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia regarding the restoration of the independence of the governments of those countries—

(1) the Import-Export Bank of the United States may not issue, or make any payment on, any insurance, reinsurance, or guarantee with respect to the financing of exports to the Soviet Union;

(2) the Soviet Union shall not be eligible to receive nondiscriminatory (most-favored nation) trade treatment from the United States;

(3) the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to oppose any grant of special association status to the Soviet Union in such institutions; and

(4) the United States shall oppose any waiver of restrictions of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development applicable to financing within the Soviet Union.

(c) In order to strengthen the hand of the democratically elected governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the President shall—

(1) redirect any Commodity Credit Corporation agricultural credits, extended to the Soviet Union, away from the central Soviet government and into the Baltic States and those Soviet Republics which are seeking such direct assistance;

(2) provide emergency medical assistance to the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania channeled through appropriate private voluntary organizations; and

(3) request that the recent issue of Soviet aggression against the Baltic people be raised in the United Nations.

(d) It is further the sense of the Congress that the President should open closer diplomatic ties with the democratically elected governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, to pave the way for official United States recognition of those governments.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 16, 1991]

WIDER CRACKDOWN IS FEARED IN BALTICS

(By Francis X. Clines)

MOSCOW, JAN. 15.—There were more signs today that the Kremlin was preparing to follow up the military crackdown in Lithuania with similar actions in the other Baltic states of Latvia and Estonia.

In the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius the National Salvation Committee, the new pro-Moscow body being used as an apparent front for inviting the Soviet military to intervene, called today for direct rule by President Mikhail S. Gorbachev.

Similar calls were heard as well in Latvia and Estonia at pro-Moscow rallies organized

by Communist Party leaders loyal to Moscow.

In Lithuania, the National Salvation Committee charged that the government, which is led by Lithuanian nationalist seeking to reestablish an independent Lithuania and which has no army, was preparing to "unleash direct military actions" and "programs" against pro-Moscow Russians and other residents.

In Moscow, where the question for some days has been whether the apparent crack-downs came as the result of a Gorbachev order or were in effect forced upon the President, Mr. Gorbachev continued to defend the army's actions in the Baltics heatedly. As he staunchly spoke for the Lithuanian crack-down, he seemed very much the man in charge and hardly a reluctant figurehead.

POLITICAL PROVOCATION

The Soviet leader also directed anger at Boris N. Yeltsin, the president of Russia, the Soviet Union's largest republic, who has attempted to rally opposition to the Kremlin's Baltic actions. Mr. Yeltsin has just signed special mutual assistance pledges with the Baltics, fearing they are only the first targets in a nationwide reactionary wave by the Gorbachev Government.

Mr. Yeltsin's suggestion that Russia might need to form its own police force and army units in self-defense was criticized by Mr. Gorbachev as a "gross violation" of the law and a "political provocation" that heightens the nation's tension.

Mr. Yeltsin has been unyielding in his alarm that the nation is quickly moving back to central dictatorship.

"It seems to me that Gorbachev is under the impression that the democratic path is too hard and has decided to turn to the iron hand," he told reporters on Monday. "It may come to the point where we cannot defend our sovereignty without a Russian army. The Baltics could be only the first in a line of republics."

TOUGHER ATTITUDE, YELTSIN SAYS

He said that Mr. Gorbachev, in a recent conversation, had indicated his tougher attitude toward the republic sovereignty issue by commenting, "Society is moving to the right."

Today Mr. Gorbachev leveled criticism of Latvian officials in a way that some took as a signal that a crackdown in their republic might be next.

The Kremlin clearly sought to bolster the case for direct rule by Mr. Gorbachev in the republics by presenting an extensive television news dispatch tonight in which central authorities claimed to have intercepted secret coded instructions for a Lithuanian military plot against Communist and Soviet authorities.

The charge, unveiled as the outside world was preoccupied with the crisis in the Persian Gulf, echoed some of the pretexts of past Kremlin military interventions in Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

The net effect was to suggest that advance justification was being laid by the Gorbachev Government for some major new Kremlin action.

In the face of this, the Lithuanian independence government focused on making a last defensive stand in Vilnius, building a 15-foot deep trench around the Parliament building and five-foot-high concrete barriers against a feared attack by Soviet tanks.

In the Baltic republic of Latvia, demands for the resignation of the democratically elected government were issued in Riga by a new National Salvation Committee similar

to the one in Lithuania in whose name Soviet tanks seized the Vilnius broadcast center on Sunday. Thirteen people were killed in that action.

Similar demands for the Estonian government to resign were made in Tallinn, the capital, after 10,000 pro-Moscow workers organized by the Communist Party rallied in behalf of the republic's return to full control by the central Government.

ENCOURAGING PROVOCATION

"We're worried something may happen this night," a Latvian official said, adding that the Kremlin is clearly encouraging provocation to civil disorder by way of "hooligan" gangs. Early today, a raid was reported at the police academy armory in Riga, with scores of rifles, pistols and machine guns allegedly seized by a rogue militia group loyal to Moscow.

In Moscow tonight, the overall sense was of a Government attending to a scenario, to prepare the groundwork for direct presidential rule in the Baltics.

On the lengthy Government-controlled evening news show, Vremya, there were various dispatches contending that the ethnic Russian minorities in the Baltics were being so abused by the nationalist majorities as to require drastic protection.

In Lithuania, such protection was suddenly extended in the form of tank troops under the aegis of the hurriedly created and still mysterious National Salvation Committee. Kremlin officials, including President Gorbachev, have not explained the legal basis for such an initiative. Baltic officials and Western diplomats said it was a traditional K.G.B. operation outside the legal framework.

"The same processes are at work in all three republics—the sudden 'salvation' committees, the demands for government resignation and for direct presidential rule," said one Western specialist on the Baltics who sensed further military steps in preparation.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry, rebutting criticism that Mr. Gorbachev's foreign policy has now been undermined by a Kremlin retreat to autocracy, insisted today that "chaos" threatened the Baltics and that it is the result of the independence campaigns and not the new military drive to force fealty.

"Things happen spontaneously," contended Vitaly Churkin, the ministry spokesman. "Sometimes in the sharp turns of history we face moments when the choice is not between good and bad, but between bad and worse."

THE CRUSHING OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DRIVE: A PRECISE SCRIPT IS DETECTED

(By Bill Keller)

VILNIUS, LITHUANIA, January 15.—From a review of recent events in Lithuania and interviews with people on both sides of the conflict, it has become clear that the crushing of the republic's drive for independence was planned with precision.

The Kremlin's campaign against the elected Parliament, which remained barricaded tonight behind walls of five-foot concrete blocks, seems to have followed an artful script with precedents in Soviet political strategy dating to the Bolshevik Revolution.

The aim is to bring to heel the elected republican and local governments that have challenged Moscow's authority, and thus to preserve the center's power, even at the price of lives and terror.

The strategy is to create the impression that two popular groups are warring for

power in Lithuania, and that the only solution is for President Mikhail S. Gorbachev reluctantly to impose direct Kremlin rule.

The main participants include the Communist Party, an array of front groups, the military, the K.G.B., and the major press and broadcasting organizations that remain under state control, especially the central television and the Tass press agency, which have recently returned to a pre-glasnost level of distortion.

PARLIAMENT VOTES FOR INDEPENDENCE

Events began last spring, when Lithuania used its first free elections under Soviet power to elect a government committed to restoring the republic's sovereignty, ended by annexation into the Soviet Union in 1940.

On March 11, Parliament voted 124 to 0, with 9 abstentions and absentees, to proclaim itself an independent state, and elected Vytautas Landsbergis, a soft-spoken music professor, to be the first President.

The Communist opposition does not deny that the Landsbergis government has a popular following, but they explain the elections as an aberration of history.

A split in the Communist Party between pro- and anti-independence factions left a power vacuum, they contend, and Mr. Landsbergis's independence movement filled it.

Juozas Jarmalavicius, the chief ideologist of the Lithuanian Communist Party and spokesman for a committee of unidentified members that claims to be the ruling power in Vilnius today, said the republics fell into a "national psychosis and euphoria," and set out to restore the "bourgeois" government that existed before World War II.

The elections and independence declaration did not polarize the republic to the extent that opponents now maintain. Opinion polls conducted throughout last year showed the government had overwhelming support from ethnic Lithuanians and substantial minority backing among the Russians, Poles and Byelorussians who make up 20 percent of the republic's 3.7 million people.

But there were divisions, especially in Vilnius, a formerly Polish city where the non-Lithuanian population is about 40 percent. Many of them resented the pressure from the new government to learn the Lithuanian language. They felt discriminated against. The large military contingent permanently based here was insulted at being labeled an occupying army.

Since losing power, the Communist Party has devoted much attention to its traditional base in the centrally run factories, playing on ethnic resentments and warning that workers would lose their jobs when Lithuanians took over and introduced capitalism.

After economic sanctions and presidential decrees failed to make the republic back down, Mr. Gorbachev came under increasing pressure from hard-liners to take tougher measures.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE CRACKDOWN

Last month, things began to move like clockwork, as this chronology shows:

Dec. 16: The Communist Party of Lithuania organized a gathering it called the Congress of Democratic Forces of Lithuania, with representatives of 22 party groups and party-related organizations to protest the course of the independence government.

The congress named a five-man leadership headed by Nikolai M. Burokyavicius, First Secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party, and four other party officials.

Dec. 20: In an unscripted development, Foreign Minister Eduard A. Shevardnadze an-

nounced that he was resigning with a warning that the country was headed toward dictatorship. He later said he had quit because he could not bear to defend the use of violence against his people.

Dec. 21: In the neighboring republic of Latvia, soldiers from all three Baltic republics organized an "independent" lobby group to protest the treatment of military families in the region. They warned that "any attempts to influence the activities of army units, as well as the everyday life of military garrisons and camps, would be stopped at once," Tass reported.

Jan. 7: Divisions with the Lithuanian government, between moderates and those favoring a more confrontational approach toward Moscow, came to a head on the issue of prices. The moderate Prime Minister, Kazimiera Prunskiene, announced sweeping price increases without a program to compensate low-income people. Parliament, headed by Mr. Landsbergis, voted the next day to rescind the new prices, in effect voting no confidence in the Prime Minister.

When Mrs. Prunskiene announced her resignation the following day, accusing Mr. Landsbergis of undermining her authority, the time was ripe for the opposition. The independent newspaper Respublika predicted in a front page editorial that the government's disarray would set the stage for a Kremlin crackdown, which would be timed to coincide with the world's focus on the Persian Gulf.

"Lithuania gave them the chance to begin the battle," the editor of Respublika, Vitas Tomkus, said in an interview today.

NO REASSURANCE FROM GORBACHEV

Jan. 8: Mrs. Prunskiene met with President Gorbachev. As she was leaving the Kremlin, she recalled in an interview Monday, she asked him whether he could assure her people that force would not be used against Lithuania.

"You cannot give them any assurances that I have not given you," she quoted the Soviet President as responding.

Thursday: Mr. Gorbachev sent a message to the Lithuanian government insisting on immediate compliance with the Soviet Constitution.

"Union authorities are receiving many appeals from social and political organizations, manufacturing collectives, and citizens of all nationalities," he said. "People are demanding that constitutional order be re-established, and that their security and living conditions be properly guaranteed. They have lost faith in the policies of the present authorities. They demand that presidential rule be established."

Friday: At a news conference in Communist Party headquarters, officials announced creation of the "National Salvation Committee of Lithuania." Mr. Jarmalavicius said the committee was appointed by the five leaders of the Congress of Democratic Forces. The membership has been kept secret.

Soviet Army troops using tanks and live ammunition soon captured the city's main publishing center and a building used by Mr. Landsbergis's fledgling militia, the Department of Territorial Defense.

PROCESS OF TRANSFER IS UNDER WAY

Saturday: "Now the process of the transfer of power in controlling the republics is under way," Mr. Jarmalavicius said, speaking for the Salvation Committee. "It will not be long."

At about midnight, a small group of workers showed up at a government building with

a petition claiming to represent the views of workers in 19 industrial enterprises. It demanded that Parliament step down and surrender all power to the National Salvation Committee.

"We are tired of permanent terror, uncertainty in the future," the petition said. "We cannot entrust the future of our children to people who did many dark and shameful things in the past today."

A Lithuanian policeman who witnessed the event told Western reporters that the workers smelled heavily of alcohol. A nervous pro-independence crowd, on full alert after the shootings the previous day, took the group as opposition infiltrators and dragged them to the Parliament building to be interrogated.

Simultaneously, another worker delegation went to the Lithuanian state television studio to deliver a complaint about nationalist programming, and was also turned away.

The incidents seemed inconsequential, but later the Soviet Interior Minister, Boris K. Pugo, asserted on national television that they marked the start of hostilities. He said that after the workers had been turned away from the government "with real bayonets," the Salvation Committee intervened and appealed to the military for help.

Maj. Gen. Vladimir N. Uskhopchik, the commander of the Vilnius military garrison, had assured reporters a few hours earlier that he had had no contacts with the National Salvation Committee and did not know whom it represented. Yet an hour after the workers were turned away by the government, the general supposedly agreed to send his troops to carry out their request.

OFFICIAL PRESS GIVES ONLY OFFICIAL LINE

Sunday: The army's coordinated assault on the television studios and broadcasting tower began at about 1:30 A.M. The attacking forces ran over unarmed civilians with tanks and fired on crowds that stood in the way.

The raids, witnessed by numerous Western reporters and filmed by Lithuanian and foreign television cameras, left 15 dead, 64 missing and more than 100 wounded, by the latest official count.

The army tank convoys were accompanied by soundtrucks announcing that "all power" in the republic had fallen to the National Salvation Committee.

The main instruments of the official press, television and the Tass agency immediately began to disseminate the official version of events—that Lithuania was spiraling out of control because of the unbounded ambitions of its nationalist leaders, and that a legitimate alternative power had sprung up to defend the interests of the working class.

The most brutal of the military moves so far was carried out early Sunday morning. Most Soviet newspapers do not publish on Sunday or Monday, leaving two days in which the more independent elements of the Soviet press raised no challenge to the official account. Later some of the more independent national newspapers like Komsomolskaya Pravda would begin to question the official version, but their access to information was restricted and their editors came under pressure to toe the official line.

The Salvation Committee's pronouncements have been treated by television and Tass as official statements, without any attempt to explain where the committee derives its authority or who its members are.

Even Mr. Gorbachev professed ignorance and said he had no foreknowledge of what the army did in Vilnius on Sunday morning.

But Mr. Tomkus, who was a member of a Soviet parliamentary commission that investigated military violence against protesters in Georgia in April 1989, said the commission had established that only Mr. Gorbachev and Defense Minister Dmitri T. Yazov had ordered to order the use of army troops.

A few hours after the bloodshed, a Kremlin delegation arrived to study the standoff in Lithuania. Their schedule of meetings with worker groups, Lithuanian intellectuals and military families seemed designed to confirm the impression of a republic near civil war.

"They're only here to gather facts and arguments to justify the imposition of presidential rule," Romualdas Ozolas, a Lithuanian official, charged after meeting with the delegation.

The delegation included one man no one regards as a puppet of the Kremlin, Levon Ter-Petrosyan, the nationalist leader elected to head the republic of Armenia. But Mr. Gorbachev may have felt that his presence would serve another purpose: to drive home to the leader of another restive republic the consequences of behaving like Lithuania.

YELTSIN RECOGNIZES REPUBLIC'S INDEPENDENCE

Monday: Another wild card. Boris N. Yeltsin, President of the Russian Republic, threw his popular authority behind Lithuania, recognizing the government as independent and signing a mutual defense protocol. He proposed to visit the republic, but Mr. Jarmalavicius said the National Salvation Committee had warned him in a telegram "that they would not guarantee his safety."

Mr. Jarmalavicius told reporters that the K.G.B. had unearthed documents showing that the Landsbergis government had an elaborate plot, Operation Shield, to kidnap Communists, take their families hostage and force them to recant or be interned. He assured reporters that the documents would be made public, and the next night they were, on central television.

Mr. Jarmalavicius said the K.G.B. would also show that the Landsbergis government had colluded with American and other Western intelligence agencies.

Despite the military seizure of publishing and broadcasting outlets, the daily Respublika used a clandestine printing plant to produce half a million copies of a broadsheet describing the army assaults, including a photograph of a man lying crushed under a tank.

The military made no moves against Respublika's editorial offices and did not shut off television and radio broadcasts in the second largest city in the republic, Kaunas, which has carried nearly continuous reports in defense of the independent government.

Why? One possibility was that it was needed to provide further evidence that the Landsbergis government was still functioning, that the situation was not under control and that presidential rule was needed.

"WE SHOT PEOPLE?" A MAJOR DENIES IT

Today: During a tour of the captured television tower for a handpicked group of six sympathetic Soviet reporters, the army major who said he commanded the attack asserted that no one had died there and that the only shooting had come from Lithuanian snipers in nearby buildings.

A reporter from the The Philadelphia Inquirer, who was allowed to join the tour, challenged the account, pointing out that he had himself witnessed the army firing on undefended civilians.

"We shot people?" responded the major, who identified himself only as Vitaly Ilyich. "You're fooling yourself." Asked about the 10 battered, crushed and bullet-ridden bodies lying in state in open coffins at the Vilnius Palace of Sports, the major shrugged and said, "Hard to say."

The main television news program, "Vremya," or "Time," tonight quoted several world leaders, often out of context, to suggest that the West understood—even if it had not fully approved—what was happening in Lithuania.

The world's reaction drew a look of dismay from Mr. Tomkus, the newspaper editor.

"The terrible thing is not that we have a new dictator, but that the whole world loves him," he said.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S.J. Res. 43. A bill to authorize and request the President to designate May 1991 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL PHYSICAL FITNESS AND SPORTS MONTH

• Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce a joint resolution which designates the month of May 1991 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month."

We no longer view physical exercise as solely for entertainment purposes. In the past few decades, a large segment of the population of this country has become conscious of, and involved in, the evergrowing fitness movement. Physical activity should be an important part of life each day for persons of all ages and abilities. Personally, I have benefited greatly from the efforts of physical exercise. Each morning, I do calisthenics for a half hour, lift weights, and I swim a half mile three times a week.

Interest in sports begins at an early age. Nearly 30 million boys and girls take part in age-grouped team sports and other organized out-of-school physical activity. More than 6 million teenagers and over 600,000 college students compete in interscholastic and intramural athletic programs.

One of every two adults in the United States engages regularly in some type of exercise and/or sports. A third of us swim; a fourth ride bicycles; and a fifth play one of the racquet sports. More than 20 million people in this country run. The number of physically active women and men has doubled in 10 years and continues to grow rapidly.

Not only are fitness and sports programs a source of pleasure and personal satisfaction by which we refresh and strengthen ourselves, but they also are good preventive programs of health care.

Last year during May, as part of the celebration of National Physical Fitness and Sports Month, 1,139,902 persons participated in some form of physical activity, from 5-kilometer walks to track meets and superstars contests. This number is only a small part of the American population. We must make

all Americans aware of the benefits offered with such programs increasingly available to everyone. Accordingly, I am introducing this joint resolution which requests President Bush to declare May 1991 as National Physical Fitness and Sports Month.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join with me and support this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 43

Whereas there is an increase in the number of adults in our country who regularly participate in exercise and sports;

Whereas the number of physically active men and women continues to grow rapidly, especially since the 1970s;

Whereas there is great support for the importance of daily exercise for youth and children regardless of physical capabilities or limitations;

Whereas there is continued growth in senior citizens' physical activity participation which increases their enjoyment and quality of life;

Whereas today we recognize that physical activity is an important part of daily life for children, adults, and senior citizens of both sexes;

Whereas physical activity is vital to good health and is a rich source of pleasure and personal satisfaction;

Whereas our physical fitness and sports programs are one of the primary means by which we strengthen our bodies and refresh our spirits; and

Whereas it is essential that we make fitness and sports programs increasingly available in the schools, at the workplace, and during leisure time so that all our citizens will be able to experience the joys and benefits they offer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the month of May 1991 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month", and to call upon Federal, State, and local government agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of those who died from service-connected disabilities; to provide for independent scientific review of the available scientific evidence regarding the health effects of exposure to certain herbicide agents, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the name of the Senator from South Caro-

lina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1, *supra*.

S. 2

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] were added as cosponsors of S. 2, a bill to promote the achievement of national education goals, to establish a National Council on Educational Goals and an Academic Report Card to measure progress on the goals, and to promote literacy in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 8

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 8, a bill to extend the time for performing certain acts under the internal revenue laws for individuals performing services as part of the Desert Shield Operation.

S. 78

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] were added as cosponsors of S. 78, a bill to provide a 5.4-percent increase in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans; and for other purposes.

S. 107

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 107, a bill to increase the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans; and for other purposes.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend qualified mortgage bonds.

S. 196

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 196, a bill to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority.

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 196, *supra*.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr.

MCCAIN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 9, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to a Federal balanced budget.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 14, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to allow the President to veto items of appropriation.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 21

At the request of Mr. SASSER, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 21, a joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Department of Commerce should utilize the statistical correction methodology to achieve a fair and accurate 1990 Census.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 39

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 39, a joint resolution to designate the month of September 1991, as "National Awareness Month for Children with Cancer."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 40

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 40, a joint resolution to designate the period commencing September 8, 1991, and ending on September 14, 1991, as "National Historically Black Colleges Week."

SENATE RESOLUTION 8

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 8, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress must approve any offensive military action against Iraq.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1—RELATIVE TO UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. CON. RES. 1

Whereas the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain expressed a commitment in the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and in the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 to seek the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time;

Whereas the Threshold Test Ban Treaty, which entered into force in December, 1990, contains a commitment in Article I that the United States and Soviet Union shall "... continue their negotiations with a view toward achieving a solution to the problem of the cessation of all underground nuclear weapon tests";

Whereas the Fiscal Year 1991 National Defense Authorization Act expressed the sense

of the Congress that "... the United States shares a special responsibility with the Soviet Union to continue the bilateral Nuclear Testing Talks to achieve further limitations on nuclear testing, including the achievement of a verifiable comprehensive test ban";

Whereas in 1988, States party to the Limited Test Ban Treaty formally proposed an amendment that would broaden its prohibition on testing in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water to include underground testing;

Whereas the early prohibition of underground nuclear explosions would constrain the development and deployment of new generations of nuclear arms, reduce reliance upon nuclear arsenals, reinvigorate efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation, and end further radioactive contamination of the environment;

Whereas the reliability and safety of nuclear weapons of the United States as deterrents to nuclear war can be assured by means other than nuclear explosive testing;

Whereas recent advances in verification techniques and recent agreements and understandings between the United States and the Soviet Union regarding in-country monitoring and on-site inspection have helped open the way to effective verification of a comprehensive ban;

Whereas the Soviet Union has pledged to join the United States in completely and permanently banning nuclear testing; and

Whereas the parties to the Limited Test Ban Treaty are considering an amendment prohibiting underground nuclear explosions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States fundamentally reassess the necessity of underground nuclear explosions, and instruct his representatives to support a comprehensive test ban at the Limited Test Ban Treaty Amendment Conference, the Conference on Disarmament, and the bilateral nuclear testing negotiations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 14—RELATIVE TO AN EXAMINATION OF SOVIET ECONOMIC BENEFITS IN LIGHT OF THE CRISIS IN THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. SIMON, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. HELMS, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. MIKULSKI, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. EXON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MACK, Mr. COATS, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. GORE, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. REID, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ROBB, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. DURENBERGER, and Mr. AKAKA) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 14

Whereas on January 7, the Soviet Defense Ministry announced the deployment of additional troops to the republics of Lithuania,

Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova (formerly Moldavia), and the Ukraine.

Whereas President Gorbachev has threatened to impose direct "presidential rule" on Lithuania in place of the democratically elected Government of Lithuania.

Whereas the peaceful resistance of the Lithuanian people has been met with brutal and violent actions by the Soviet armed forces.

Whereas on January 11, more than a dozen people were killed and over one hundred injured when Soviet troops stormed and took control of the Lithuanian Republic's radio and television station effectively cutting off the Lithuanian Government's chief means of communication with the Lithuanian people.

Whereas the United States has never recognized the forcible annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

Whereas the United States Government has repeatedly communicated to President Gorbachev that the use of force in the Baltic States could seriously jeopardize United States-Soviet relations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that:

SECTION 1. The President should (i) immediately review all economic benefits provided by the United States Government to the Soviet Union, (ii) expeditiously report to the Congress on whether those benefits should be suspended in light of Soviet actions in the Baltic States, (iii) immediately suspend all ongoing technical exchanges, (iv) consider withdrawing United States support for Soviet membership in the IMF, World Bank or GATT, and (v) not proceed with the provision of MFN trade treatment until the following events have occurred:

(a) Soviet troops refrain from obstructing the functioning of the democratic governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

(b) The troops that were deployed following the January 7 announcement by the Soviet Defense Ministry are withdrawn;

(c) Soviet authorities cease their interference with the telecommunications, print, and other media in these states;

(d) Good-faith negotiations between the democratically elected governments of the Baltic States and the Soviet Union on the restoration of the sovereignty of those states have begun;

(e) Concrete assurances are received from President Gorbachev that grain purchased with United States credits will not be used to coerce the Baltic States, or any republic of the Soviet Union, to sign the Union Treaty.

SEC. 2. The United States should consult with and encourage our allies to follow a policy similar to that outlined in section 1.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE SEEING EYE

• Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, today, January 16, 1991, the Seeing Eye of Morristown, NJ, the first and most famous dog guide school in North America, will reach a milestone when it places its 10,000th seeing eye dog with a blind person.

Since 1929, the Seeing Eye has enabled blind people from the United States and Canada to lead independent and fulfilling lives because of their seeing eye dogs. Indeed, the 10,000 dogs have meant a million opportunities for

the thousands of blind people fortunate enough to have one.

Today, Seeing Eye graduates hold positions in such fields as law, teaching, computer programming, religion, health care, factory work, social work, and journalism. All went to the seeing eye with great expectations and, because of their seeing eye dogs, are realizing them.

Families and countless children throughout the country have been touched by the unparalleled friendship between a seeing eye dog and its master. They have been inspired by the accomplishments the dog has enabled the blind person to achieve. There are several accounts of seeing eye dogs enabling blind people to undertake everyday tasks such as commuting to work, visiting a friend, shopping, or walking on the beach. The Seeing Eye has brought national and international recognition to New Jersey since it moved to New Jersey in 1931.

Mr. President, the Seeing Eye is one of the Thousand Points of Light and it deserves recognition. I salute their valuable contribution to America. •

PRESIDENT BUSH SALUTES VIQAR SHAMIM AS 326TH "DAILY POINT OF LIGHT"

• Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the admirable efforts and successes of Viqar Shamim, a resident of Hillsboro, OR, who has been instrumental in making mathematics more enjoyable and interesting for young people in Oregon.

Mr. Shamim is a software engineer for Intel Corp. and has used his computer prowess to advance the learning of the youth in his area through a creative form of community service.

Several years ago when Mr. Shamim discovered that his son was having trouble with math, he created a computer program to assist his son in learning math. When the boy's math skills improved dramatically, Mr. Shamim realized the program helped make young people receptive to learning math.

Mr. Shamim then set out to help other students conquer similar learning difficulties. He redesigned the computer program to allow the students to challenge themselves according to their abilities and needs, and offered it to the Ladd Acres Elementary School in Aloha, OR, for use in its math classes.

However, the school could not use the programs because it did not have any computers. Mr. Shamim solved this problem by approaching his employer, Intel Corp., and obtained 15 computers and 5 printers as donations. He then spent a year installing the computers and completed the project in 1989.

But Mr. Shamim's dedication to this project didn't stop there. He continues

to spend many mornings before work instructing teachers on how to use the software, and visits the classrooms on an ongoing basis to ensure that teachers and students are not having a problem with the program. Mr. Shamim provided additional assistance by writing a user-friendly guide to the system as well.

As recognition for Mr. Shamim's hard work and dedication to educating young Oregonians, President Bush has saluted Mr. Shamim as the 326th "Daily Point of Light." The Daily Point of Light recognition is intended to call every individual and group in America to claim society's problems as their own by taking direct and consequential action, like the efforts taken by Mr. Shamim.

On behalf of Oregon, and the many youngsters that he has helped, I say to Mr. Shamim, Thank you. His service is much appreciated. •

THE COMPREHENSIVE URANIUM ACT OF 1991

• Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator FORD as a cosponsor of S. 210, the Comprehensive Uranium Act of 1991. Senator FORD has taken the lead on this very important issue, and I congratulate him for both his commitment and his persistence on this issue.

This legislation would restructure and revitalize the uranium enrichment enterprise of the Department of Energy. The Senate has passed similar legislation no less than five times during the last two Congresses. The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has been diligent in its efforts over the past 4 years to address this issue. The state of the Department's enrichment program is one of the most important and serious issues within the committee's jurisdiction.

The text of S. 210 is essentially the same as that passed by the Senate in the 101st Congress. The only difference is that deletion of provisions related to licensing that were enacted into law separately at the end of the last session.

The Senate has dealt with the uranium enrichment issue persistently for the last 4 years. We have argued these issues over and over again. Therefore, I am confident that the Energy Committee will again move quickly to report legislation and that it will be passed by the Senate early in the first session. We moved this legislation further in the House in 1990 than ever before. This year, we must go the final distance with enrichment legislation to make it a public law.

The problems of Department's uranium enrichment enterprise are calling out for help from the Congress. The uranium enrichment enterprise is essentially a \$1.5 billion business operated by the Department. Unfortu-

nately, it is a business headed for collapse. The Department used to have revenues of over \$2 billion annually. The Department used to have a substantial hold on the world market. But today the Department is selling uranium enrichment for twice the spot market price, and it has a little less than half of the world market.

The enrichment capacity in the world substantially exceeds the demand for enrichment services. There are large excess inventories being offered for sale, so it is a buyer's market. Unfortunately, the Department has become a high-cost supplier. As a result, major new, low-cost suppliers are challenging DOE for market share. The biggest such supplier is the Soviet Union. Changes need to be made in the way the Department does business, so that it can continue to compete for this market. We cannot afford to have this enterprise slip away because of our failure to face up to the changes that need to be made.

The problems of the uranium enrichment enterprise stem from the fact that the Department is still operating under a statute that assumes it has no competitors. The pricing requirements and all of the administrative and financial controls of the enrichment pro-

gram were designed under the presumption of monopoly control. The program still operates in context of this bureaucratic redtape, notwithstanding the fact that the market has changed dramatically. The market is now a highly competitive international market. The structure of the uranium enrichment enterprise must be changed accordingly if the program is to survive.

S. 210 would restructure the enrichment enterprise as a wholly owned Government corporation and give it the flexibility to operate in a competitive environment. There is precious little time left to take these actions if this enterprise is to survive intact. By 1995, the Department's long-term contracts will begin to expire. The existence of long-term contracts between the Department and U.S. utilities is the main thing that has kept the enterprise alive for the past several years. As these contracts begin to expire, the utilities will go elsewhere for their supply unless the Department can compete in the marketplace. We must act now to avoid that collapse. We cannot afford to wait until 1995 when the problem will be even more readily apparent but when it may be too late to recover. •

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of today's session the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, January 17, or subject to the call the majority leader, if the majority leader after consultation with the Republican leader determines that convening the Senate prior to 10 a.m. is appropriate under the circumstances; that following the prayer at the time the Senate next reconvenes the Journal of Proceedings be deemed approved to date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

CONDITIONAL RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if no other Senator is seeking recognition, and there is no other business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order until 10 a.m. Thursday, January 17.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:02 p.m., recessed until tomorrow, Thursday, January 17, at 10 a.m.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order until 10 a.m. Thursday, January 17.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:02 p.m., recessed until tomorrow, Thursday, January 17, at 10 a.m.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order until 10 a.m. Thursday, January 17.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:02 p.m., recessed until tomorrow, Thursday, January 17, at 10 a.m.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order until 10 a.m. Thursday, January 17.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:02 p.m., recessed until tomorrow, Thursday, January 17, at 10 a.m.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE BEARING EYE

Mr. BEARLEY. Mr. President, today I am pleased to announce that the Bearing Eye, a blind person's guide, has been developed by a team of blind people from the United States and Canada. The Bearing Eye is a small, portable device that can be used by blind people to navigate their way through a city or a large building. It is a simple, yet effective, device that can be used by anyone, regardless of their level of blindness. The Bearing Eye is a small, portable device that can be used by blind people to navigate their way through a city or a large building. It is a simple, yet effective, device that can be used by anyone, regardless of their level of blindness.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THANKS TO FUNDESA'S EFFORTS

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I had the privilege of traveling to Guatemala as part of an international team to observe that country's Presidential election run-off.

What I saw was a very organized and open election. To say the least, I was very impressed and heartened at the steps Guatemala has taken toward democracy in recent years.

I would like to offer my sincere appreciation to the Guatemalan Development Foundation, better known as FUNDESA, for all it did to ensure that the Guatemalan election was both free and fair. FUNDESA is a nonprofit, non-partisan, organization whose primary goal is to help to develop the country of Guatemala.

FUNDESA helped organize international observer teams for both the November election and the January 6 run-off election. Thanks to FUNDESA's efforts, close to 2½ million votes were cast in the two elections.

As we look to the future of Central America, we can rest assured that FUNDESA will be working to ensure a better tomorrow for the people of Guatemala. I would like to enter into the RECORD the attached statement released by FUNDESA following the run-off election:

PRELIMINARY FUNDESA OBSERVER
DELEGATION STATEMENT

We congratulate the Guatemalan people on the occasion of today's election, which will mark the first transfer of power from one elected civilian to another in Guatemalan history. The second round of the 1990-1991 election is a major step in the evolution of democracy in Guatemala.

We would like to note that our delegation is composed almost entirely of new members, and the conclusions we have reached have not in any way been affected by the November delegation's report. Our conclusions are based solely on what we have observed today in 21 cities and towns in eight departments of Guatemala.

Our delegation was deeply impressed by the organization of the electoral process today. We had complete, unrestricted access in all areas the delegation visited. We were pleased to see that the two parties had volunteer observers at virtually all the polling places we saw. The orderly and efficient process indicates that elections have become almost routine in Guatemala—a significant and positive change from less than a decade ago.

We were pleased to see that the armed forces and police observed established procedures. The group observed no intimidation at the polls—another sign of the maturing of Guatemalan democracy.

Many voters expressed a strong sense of civic responsibility and pride. In many polling places, voting seemed to have become a "family affair"—another healthy sign for the

future. We were also impressed by the participation of women and young people in the electoral process.

Some members of this delegation heard isolated charges of irregularities or intimidation. We will report these to the Supreme Electoral Tribunal, and we encourage them to investigate these charges. All members of the group agreed, however, that these allegations did NOT affect the overall integrity of the election process. Some members will also make recommendations to the Electoral Tribunal regarding such issues as the location of polling sites and the design of voting stands.

We commend the Electoral Tribunal, the government of Guatemala, and especially the Guatemalan people for this important step in the democratic process. Our preliminary conclusion is that today's election was free and fair, and that the Guatemalan democratic process has been strengthened. We recognize, however, that a final conclusion will have to await the tabulation of all ballots. In closing, we would also like to express our sincere gratitude to FUNDESA, the Guatemalan Development Foundation, for their generous support and assistance to our observer delegation.

FULL TEXT OF PRESIDENT BUSH'S
LETTER TO SADDAM HUSSEIN

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, during the House of Representatives debate on Saturday, January 12, 1991 reference was made to the President's letter dated January 5, 1991 to Saddam Hussein. I am today submitting the full text of this document and commend it to my colleagues attention. I am also including an analysis, as of today, on actions taken by the 28 countries who are providing military forces to the International Coalition in the Persian Gulf. That action is as follows:

British: 1-15-91, the British Parliament voted 534 to 57 in favor of the use of force to implement the 12 Security Council Resolutions to achieve Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait.

France: 1-16-91, voted 523 to 26 to affirm the U.N. Resolutions, the 26 who voted in the negative were all communists.

Canada: 1-15-91, the debate in the House of Commons began with the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister giving statements. The debate is expected to last to the end of the week. The vote is scheduled for Friday. You should be reminded that the House of Commons voted on Nov. 29, 1990 to endorse the U.N. Security Council Resolution which included U.N. Resolution 678. There are 285 seats in the Canadian House of Commons the vote is expected to be along straight party lines and will carry by 20 votes.

Federal Republic of Germany—doesn't require parliamentary action for deployment

of forces to Turkey since it is in the context of NATO.

Italy—The Italian Parliament has debated the Government policy to deploy Italian forces to the Persian Gulf. No formal vote is required.

Turkey—The Parliament has approved inviting foreign forces into Turkey for purposes of enhancing the defense of Turkish sovereign territory. A separate vote is required for Turkish forces to engage in any offensive action.

Egypt—No parliamentary action required and no debate has taken place.

Morocco—No parliamentary action required and no debate has taken place.

Pakistan—No parliamentary action required, however, the Parliament voted to commend the Prime Minister for sending ground and naval forces to the Persian Gulf.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, January 5, 1991.

His Excellency SADDAM HUSSEIN,

President of the Republic of Iraq, Baghdad.

MR. PRESIDENT: We stand today at the brink of war between Iraq and the world. This is a war that began with your invasion of Kuwait; this is a war that can be ended only by Iraq's full and unconditional compliance with UN Security Council Resolution 678.

I am writing you now, directly, because what is at stake demands that no opportunity be lost to avoid what would be a certain calamity for the people of Iraq. I am writing, as well, because it is said by some that you do not understand just how isolated Iraq is and what Iraq faces as a result. I am not in a position to judge whether this impression is correct; what I can do, though, is try in this letter to reinforce what Secretary of State Baker told your Foreign Minister and eliminate any uncertainty or ambiguity that might exist in your mind about where we stand and what we are prepared to do.

The international community is united in its call for Iraq to leave all of Kuwait without condition and without further delay. This is not simply the policy of the United States; it is the position of the world community as expressed in no less than twelve Security Council resolutions.

We prefer a peaceful outcome. However, anything less than full compliance with UN Security Council Resolution 678 and its predecessors is unacceptable. There can be no reward for aggression. Nor will there be any negotiation. Principle cannot be compromised. However, by its full compliance, Iraq will gain the opportunity to rejoin the international community. More immediately, the Iraqi military establishment will escape destruction. But unless you withdraw from Kuwait completely and without condition, you will lose more than Kuwait. What is at issue here is not the future of Kuwait—it will be free, its government will be restored—but rather the future of Iraq. This choice is yours to make.

The United States will not be separated from its coalition partners. Twelve Security Council resolutions, 28 countries providing military units to enforce them, more than one hundred governments complying with

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

sanctions—all highlight the fact that it is not Iraq against the United States, but Iraq against the world. That most Arab and Muslim countries are arrayed against you as well should reinforce what I am saying. Iraq cannot and will not be able to hold onto Kuwait or exact a price for leaving.

You may be tempted to find solace in the diversity of opinion that is American democracy. You should resist any such temptation. Diversity ought not to be confused with division. Nor should you underestimate, as others have before you, America's will.

Iraq is already feeling the effects of the sanctions mandated by the United Nations. Should war come, it will be a far greater tragedy for you and your country. Let me state, too, that the United States will not tolerate the use of chemical or biological weapons or the destruction of Kuwait's oil fields and installations. Further, you will be held directly responsible for terrorist actions against any member of the coalition. The American people would demand the strongest possible response. You and your country will pay a terrible price if you order unconscionable acts of this sort.

I write this letter not to threaten, but to inform. I do so with no sense of satisfaction, for the people of the United States have no quarrel with the people of Iraq. Mr. President, UN Security Council Resolution 678 establishes the period before January 15 of this year as a "pause of good will" so that this crisis may end without further violence. Whether this pause is used as intended, or merely becomes a prelude to further violence, is in your hands, and yours alone. I hope you weigh your choice carefully and choose wisely, for much will depend upon it.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE REASONABLE DETENTION OF ALIENS ACT

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that relates to a situation that I believe is deplorable and reflects a tragic disregard for basic human decency in the way our country has treated refugees. Allow me to describe a situation in which I became personally involved.

About 2 years ago I awoke on a Saturday morning and read a story in the Washington Post that was very disturbing. The story was about a Salvadoran woman, with three young children, who was detained by the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] and sent to jail. The woman was nursing a 6-week-old infant who was suffering from a fever and an infection. The INS detained the woman when she went to the local immigration office for what she was led to believe was a routine interview. Despite the fact that she was the sole caretaker of three small children, one of whom was a sick infant, the authorities jailed her and made plans to deport her on the next plane back to El Salvador.

I became involved and urged the INS to release the woman. Eventually, the woman and her three children were granted refugee status by Canada, since our Government would not grant her permanent status in the United States. The significance of this story is not in

the conclusion but in how our Government treats human beings—regardless of their legal status as aliens.

This tragic episode took place in what is supposed to be the most humanitarian country in the world, the United States. It is upsetting that our Immigration Service treats individuals who are seeking refuge in our country to escape oppression and violation of their human rights in such an insensitive way. This woman was no threat to society yet the INS arrested her and separated her from her children.

This kind of inhumane treatment of individuals who are seeking refuge in our country should not happen. The legislation that I am introducing today would prohibit the INS from detaining a mother, who has dependent children younger than the age of 2 years, for more than 24 hours. Last year I offered this legislation as an amendment to the Family Unity and Employment Opportunity Immigration Act. My amendment was adopted by the House but the provision was not included in the conference report and thus did not become law. Nevertheless, I firmly believe that this proposal is necessary.

This legislation is not complicated. It does not alter our immigration policy or effect the conditions of acceptance or rejection of aliens under current law. My amendment simply dictates that our Immigration Service must use a reasonable sense of human decency in detaining individuals who are caring for young dependent children.

I urge my colleagues to support my proposal. The text of this bill is as follows:

H.R. 539

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reasonable Detention of Aliens Act".

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON DETENTION OF CERTAIN ALIENS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 242(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "When" and inserting "(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), when"; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) The Attorney General shall not detain any alien described in subparagraph (B) who is deportable under section 241, except in connection with the immediate departure of such alien. The period of such detention shall not exceed a reasonable amount of time based upon the particular circumstances of the alien and his or her dependent children, not to exceed a 24-hour period.

"(B) An alien described in this subparagraph is an alien—

"(i) who is not deportable under paragraph (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), or (19) of section 241(a); and

"(ii) who is the mother of any child in the United States who is not older than 2 years of age and is dependent upon the alien for basic parental care."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to any alien subject to a final deportation order on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

FATHER MURGAS, WILKES-BARRE PRIEST, HONORED FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 25, 1990, the citizens of Wilkes-Barre and I joined together to honor and remember a man who not only was kind, artistic, and devoted in his religious faith, but was a successful inventor as well.

Father Joseph Murgas served as pastor of Sacred Heart of Jesus Slovak Church in Wilkes-Barre, PA. Originally from Tajov, Slovakia, Father Murgas began experimenting with wireless communications in 1898 in a little shack behind his church.

Eventually, after much hard work, Father Murgas invented a new and more efficient system of wireless communication. Recording his success at the U.S. Patent Office, he began to receive recognition and kudos—including praise saying that his system was superior to that of Marconi's.

On November 23, 1905, a public demonstration was given and the phrase, "Glory Be To God" was transmitted, thus the first known system of workable overland radio was introduced.

Shortly thereafter, Marconi visited with Father Murgas and later introduced his own system to the world, one exactly like Father Murgas'.

Marconi has gone down in history as the "Father of Modern Radio," but Father Murgas certainly paved the way. Because the good priest was a modest and humble man, he did not seem to mind that he did not receive the credit he deserved. However, thanks to the hard work and dedication of Michael Novrocki and Scott Stefanides, Father Murgas has received the proper recognition for his contributions.

On November 25, 1990, the 85th anniversary of Father Murgas' first public transmission of sound over land, we dedicated a historical marker in Wilkes-Barre in his honor. This marker reminds us of Father Murgas and the countless others who led the way in progress and made this country what it is today.

BILLY GRANTHAM'S 40 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government lost a valued, dedicated employee on October 3, 1990, when Billy Grantham of Brentwood, TN, retired as executive assistant to the Nashville District Commander, Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Grantham's retirement brings to an end a career that spanned more than 40 years of outstanding service to his Government and his country with the U.S. Postal Service, Army Aviation and the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Grantham started his career in June 1950 when he was appointed postal clerk in the main post office in Memphis, TN. He served the public and the Federal Government until he was called to active military duty in 1951 with the famous 118th Tactical Reconnaissance Wing, Tennessee Air National Guard.

He served his country with honor in the United States Air Force during the Korean conflict, after which he was awarded the Good Conduct Medal and honorably discharged.

He returned to civilian Government service in 1952 with the U.S. Post Office in Memphis.

From 1960 until 1975, Mr. Grantham performed in a high-level management position with the U.S. Army Aviation Center and U.S. Army Aviation School at Fort Rucker, AL, which is now headquarters for the aviation branch of the Army. While at Fort Rucker, he continued to serve the public, his Government and his country with professionalism, distinction and dedication, receiving numerous honors for his contributions to the training of Army aviators and Army aircraft mechanics during ongoing military actions in Vietnam.

From 1975 until 1990, Mr. Grantham served his Government and the people of Tennessee in his highly-responsible position with the Corps of Engineers, Nashville District, Nashville, TN. During his time with the corps, he was recognized and rewarded for his performance above and beyond that expected of the average Federal manager.

In addition to his effective and efficient performance as a Federal worker, Mr. Grantham was an active contributor to the quality of life in his community. He has been a member of Kiwanis International for 15 years, attaining the position of lieutenant governor, Kiwanis, for the State of Alabama.

While with the corps, he served as president of the Middle Tennessee Federal Executives Association and has been a member of the board of directors of the Nashville post of the Society of American Military Engineers.

Our Government and the citizens of this great country will miss the faithful, professional, and dedicated service of Mr. Billy Grantham.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE KENNETH J. SANBORN

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the occasion of the retirement of the Honorable Kenneth J. Sanborn, circuit judge for the Sixteenth Judicial Circuit in Mount Clemens, MI.

Over the years, Judge Sanborn has enjoyed a fine reputation as a distinguished jurist in our community and throughout the State of Michigan. He has shown his legal skill both as visiting judge on the Michigan Court of Appeals and as senior probate judge in Macomb County.

Before his appointment to the sixteenth circuit, Judge Sanborn represented Macomb County in the Michigan House of Representa-

tives and was supervisor of Clinton Township. He was also a charter member of the Macomb County Community College Board of Trustees—the premier institution of higher education in our area.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the retirement of Ken Sanborn, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending best wishes to Judge Sanborn and his entire family. His dedication and commitment will be greatly missed.

KILDEE HONORS FALL 1990 HOUSE PAGES

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude to all of the pages who have served so diligently in the House of Representatives during the historic "Bicentennial Congress."

These dedicated and hard working young people will soon be leaving to complete their high school education. They are: Warren Aeron, Andrea Alfaro, Elisabeth Alkire, Elizabeth Ambrose, Kenneth Archer, Heather Arnet, John Baehr, Scott Beal, Roger Beckett, Christine Bergmann, Rachel Borak, Eskunder Boyd, Whitney Campbell, Adam Carstens, Benjamin Chinnery, Christopher Cohen, Misti Coy, Lauren Creamer, Allison Davis, Christopher Davis, Sean Donahue, Mark Easterday, Brian Fallon, Randall Fine, Eva Fisher, Genevieve Ford, Keri Francis, James Geraci, Andrew Grice, Ann Guthmiller, Maryann Hopson, Mary Hubbell, Karl Hughes, Vicki Irish, Jennifer Johnson, Karen Keller, Max Koltuv, Marian Leonardo, Samuel Lismann, Alfonso Martel, Vicki McAvoy, Camilla Messing, Matthew Miller, Cecilia Montalvo, Hilary Munger, Gilmer Murdock III, Gregory Newmark, Maria Phoenix, Ajna Pisani, Brian Ross, Abigail Rozen, James Sager, Anna Sieperda, Ann Silbert, Karla Staha, Jaco Stokes, Brent Tahajian, Damon Tandy, Nwadiemba Uzoukwu, Bradley Walent, LaTonya Wesley, Raynaldo Whitty and Joshua Zeitz.

We all recognize the important role that congressional pages play in helping the House of Representatives operate. This group of young people, who come from all across our Nation, represent what is good about our country. To become a page these people have proven themselves to be academically qualified. They have ventured away from the security of their home and families to spend time in an unfamiliar city. Through this experience they have witnessed a new culture, made new friends, and learned the details of how our Government operates.

As we all know, the job of a congressional page is not an easy one. Along with being away from home, the pages must possess the maturity to balance competing demands for their time and energy. In addition, they must have the dedication to work long hours and the ability to interact with people at a personal level. I am sure they will consider this to be one of the most valuable and exciting jobs of their lives, and that with this experience they will all move ahead to lead successful and productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Page Board, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this group of distinguished young Americans. They certainly will be missed.

A TRIBUTE TO BILL SPEYERS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the outstanding contributions and fine public service of Bill Speyers of Big Bear Lake. Bill is widely respected and has been a community leader for many years, most recently as mayor of Big Bear Lake.

Bill Speyers studied electrical engineering at the University of California, Berkeley, and received his MBA at the University of California, Fullerton. For 40 years, he has been a positive force in industry engineering, program management, forward planning, marketing and sales. Bill retired to Big Bear Lake in 1985 where he has become an active member of the community.

Bill served on the Big Bear Lake City Council for 4 years, 2 years as mayor. In that capacity, he has worked diligently to address local concerns including solid waste problems and obtaining funds for local road improvements. He was also appointed by former California Governor Deukmejian to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and has served as president of the San Bernardino Associated Governments. In addition, Bill has served as a member of the Valley Water Study Association, president of AARP, and worked on the League of California Cities' Resolution Committee and the local hospital board of directors.

Bill has been active in a number of community service organizations including the VFW, Elks, the Chamber of Commerce, the Republican Club, Hospital Auxiliary, and the Big Bear Amateur Radio Club. He plays an important role as a member of the San Bernardino County Flood Control District Advisory Committee and as chairman of the recently formed Mining Monitoring Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and our colleagues as we honor the fine achievements of Bill Speyers. Bill is a model of community service and activism. His years of service certainly make him worthy of recognition by the House today.

MIDDLE EAST CONCERN

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received hundreds of letters and telephone calls expressing increased concern over the crisis in the Middle East.

At this time, I would like to share with my colleagues a recent thought-provoking letter from my friend and constituent William S.

Owen of Paducah, KY. In his letter Steve Owen expresses his deep concern over several issues, including the financial and defense implications of our involvement in the Middle East, the question of Arab loyalties if fighting begins or if Israel is brought into the conflict, and particularly the religious restrictions placed on American soldiers in Saudi Arabia.

I urge my colleagues to read the letter from William S. Owen. The letter follows in its entirety:

PADUCAH, KY, January 8, 1991.

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD,
The Capitol Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: I have become very concerned about our position in the Persian Gulf. It seems to me that we are putting too much military muscle in one confined area of the world. This is of concern for the following reasons.

1. If Saddam Hussein attacks Israel, what position will the United States be in when Israel counterattacks? Can we forsake our long time ally when the Arabs change loyalties with the blowing of the sands? Will the Saudis and the other Moslem forces forsake the United States led alliance and attack Israel also?

2. Once the shooting begins, will Moslem Iran join the fighting against us?

3. With so many forces in one place and with the Soviets beginning to revert to the old hard line, who will defend the United States mainland if we are attacked by foreign forces while the bulk of our forces are in the Persian Gulf?

I believe the Soviets will once again become a closed society in a matter of months.

Also, why are we bowing to a country's wishes against showing American military pride and not allowing our soldiers to openly worship as they please? Would we stop a Saudi from following his faith while in the United States? This just astounds me that we are worried about offending the Saudis. Believe me if I was an American Soldier in the Persian Gulf I would display the flag patch on my uniform as well as worship as a Kentucky Southern Baptist!

If the Saudis want us there, they should pay much more of the cost of the operation since they are making billions of oil dollars off of the crisis.

Congressman Hubbard, thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. OWENS.

THE CONTINUING CRISIS IN THE BALTIC STATES

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, while the world's attention is riveted on the situation in the gulf, the crisis in the Baltic States continues. The brave peoples and leaderships of these small nations are locked in a pitched battle for their survival and have called upon the nations of the West, and primarily the United States, not to forget them and their struggle at this pivotal juncture.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs is actively involved to focus attention of the plight of the Baltic people as well as to encourage con-

gressional statements on their behalf. Representative LEE HAMILTON's Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East will, in the very near future, hold hearings on the crisis in the Baltic States. Tomorrow, the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, will hold its own hearing on the Baltic crisis. The witness is Mr. Raymond Seitz, the Assistant Secretary of State for Europe. A letter to Soviet President Gorbachev from the Committee on Foreign Affairs is being prepared which will strongly condemn Soviet actions in the Baltic States and urge a peaceful resolution of the crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I think a review of the current situation in the Baltic States is in order.

An uneasy truce prevails throughout the three Baltic States. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians turned out this morning for an emotional funeral for the 14 killed in the violence over the weekend. Yesterday, mass demonstrations were held by non-Lithuanians in support of continued union with the U.S.S.R.

In all three states, the freely elected Governments and Parliaments took steps to secure their buildings and facilities from takeover by the Soviet military and all of them have been holed up in their respective Parliament buildings. Thousands of Lithuanians remain outside the Lithuanian Parliament as they have for practically the past week. Lithuanian President Landsbergis today called on the United States and the Western nations to postpone military action against Iraq for a few days since it is obvious that the Kremlin is timing its crackdown on the Baltic States to coincide with Western preoccupation in the gulf.

In Riga, Latvia last night, antiterrorist units of the Soviet Interior Ministry raided a Latvian police academy, seized ammunition, roughed up some cadets, and then withdrew.

Russian Republic President Boris Yeltsin continues to play a rather prominent, even heroic, role in trying to pressure the Soviet military and Gorbachev into backing off from their confrontation with the Baltic States. Earlier today at a meeting with the Ambassadors of the Nordic countries—all of whom have been vocal and firm in their condemnation of Soviet actions in the Baltic—Yeltsin warned that the Russian Republic would be forced to take some kind of unspecified action if Gorbachev did not reduce pressure on the Baltic States. Yeltsin also warned that Russia, by far the largest of the Republics, would consider forming its own army to defend its newly declared sovereignty.

Gorbachev strongly criticized Yeltsin for these remarks and also stepped up his vocal attacks on the leaders of all three Baltic States, claiming his office has been inundated by telegrams and letters urging him to take decisive action to restore order. The shadowy National Salvation Committee in Lithuania—widely assumed to be a puppet of the pro-Moscow wing of the Lithuanian Communist Party—has also stepped up its rhetoric, charging that the Lithuanian Parliament has adopted laws that would unleash military action against the Soviet Army and cause the physical destruction of Communists, non-Lithuanians and others in the Republic. It reiterated calls for direct Presidential role in Lithuania.

Gorbachev has yet to show his complete hand but, according to the Washington Post today, there is widespread belief among both his supporters and opponents that he will end up imposing direct Presidential rule over Lithuania, at least. Direct, Presidential rule is a murky concept, adopted as part of emergency legislation late last year by the Supreme Soviet under the urging of Gorbachev himself. Under Presidential rule, Gorbachev—as the President of the entire U.S.S.R.—would have the following powers:

To take draconian measures to ensure public order in the event of a threat to the security of Soviet citizens or the state;

To ban public meetings and strikes; Cut communications, impose curfews, and restrictions on the movement of citizens; and Perhaps most importantly, to suspend democratically elected institutions, meaning all the Governments and Parliaments not only in the three Baltic States but all other Republics as well.

Needless to say, Gorbachev remains the key figure in the Baltic drama as well as in the Soviet crisis in general. Above all, Gorbachev has declared as his primary goal the preservation of the unity and integrity of the Soviet state. All his recent actions should be viewed in this context. To paraphrase an old Leninist dictum, he is taking "one step back"; that is, to impose, as peacefully as possible, Soviet control over the chaotic situation in all the potential break-away republics in order "to take two steps forward"; that is, to bring meaningful reform and democratization to the country which could include, eventually, independence—or at least special status—for the Baltic States.

In this goal of preserving the stability and unity of the U.S.S.R. Gorbachev has been forced to rely on the Soviet Army, the pro-Moscow rumps of the Baltic Communist Parties, and most of the nonindigenous peoples of the three Republics, all of whom are worried about their future in independent Baltic States. Slavic people—Russians, Poles, Ukrainians, and Byelorussians—account for about 20 percent of the population of Lithuania, nearly 50 percent of Latvia, and 40 percent of Estonia. Most settled there after World War II and have been employed primarily as industrial workers and military personnel, many of whom have retired in the region. While they are divided over the issue of Baltic independence, all fear the consequences of living under national-oriented, independent Baltic leaderships.

The situation in the Baltic States is tense and complex. Unfortunately, no easy, peaceful solutions are available. It is our duty and obligation to continue to press the Soviet Government and President Gorbachev in particular to cease their military pressure on the Baltic States and to immediately enter into honest negotiations with the democratic, freely elected Governments of these states aimed at assuring their self-determination and eventual independence.

PROHIBIT OPEN CONTAINERS IN VEHICLES

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that one of the most senseless and outrageous crimes in our society is drunk driving. The mixture of drinking and driving is more than dangerous—it is deadly. In 1988, over 23,000 people died on our Nation's roads in alcohol-related accidents. That figure was about half of the total number of traffic fatalities for that year. In addition to the lost lives and despair that are attendant to the carnage on the highways, drunk driving costs this country an estimated \$24 billion a year.

Despite this frightening reality about alcohol-related traffic accidents, the States and the Federal Government have done little to curb this serious problem. Currently it is perfectly legal in 10 States in this country for a driver to get in a car, put one hand on the steering wheel and the other hand on a bottle of whiskey, drive off drinking. Also, in 28 States it is legal for passengers in a vehicle to be drinking while the vehicle is in operation. That is outrageous. In fact, you could load up a car with passengers in New Hampshire and meander as far west as Nevada with the driver or passengers drinking all the way and not break the law. It seems to me that something decisive has to be done urgently.

I believe that we in the Congress must do something at the Federal level to urge States to adopt open container laws. That is why I have introduced legislation today that would require States to enact laws that would prohibit open containers in vehicles. This legislation would withhold 5 percent of the State's highway funds if the State fails to enact laws prohibiting open containers in vehicles.

Drinking and driving cannot be seen as a personal moral decision. When someone decides to drink and drive, that person is not simply putting himself in danger. That person is a threat to innocent drivers, passengers, and pedestrians. The odds are that 2 out of every 5 Americans will be involved in an alcohol-related traffic accident, regardless of their drinking habits. The fact is that every third drunk driving fatality is an innocent victim—a nondrinking driver, passenger, or pedestrian.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of tough talk about attacking the drug problem in this country. The country seems poised to mobilize to fight drugs and the crimes associated with the narcotics trade. However, America also has a very serious problem with alcohol and drunk driving, and we seem to be taking a vacation from our responsibilities in that area. My proposed amendment takes a positive step and makes good public policy. It provides a strong incentive for States to enact laws prohibiting the insane behavior of drinking in a moving vehicle. If States fail to comply, they would be subject to the same penalty that was utilized when the Federal Government enacted legislation requiring States to raise the minimum drinking age to 21 years of age—namely, withholding of 5 percent of Federal highway funds.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. The text of this bill is as follows:

H.R. 540

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. OPEN CONTAINER LAWS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 159. Open container limitations

"(a) WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS FOR NON-COMPLIANCE.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—The Secretary shall withhold 5 percent of the amount required to be apportioned to any State under each of sections 104(b)(1), 104(b)(2), 104(b)(5), and 104(b)(6) of this title on the first day of each fiscal year succeeding the first fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1992 in which the possession of any open alcoholic beverage container, or the consumption of any alcoholic beverage, in the passenger area of any motor vehicle located on a public highway, or the right-of-way of a public highway, in such State is lawful.

"(2) LIMITATION OF APPLICATION TO CHARTER BUSES.—If a State has in effect a law which makes unlawful the possession of any open alcoholic beverage container in the passenger area by the driver (and not the passengers) of any motor vehicle designed to transport more than 10 passengers, including the driver, while being used to provide charter transportation of passengers, such State shall be deemed to be in compliance with paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such motor vehicles in each fiscal year in which such law is in effect.

"(b) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY; EFFECT OF COMPLIANCE AND NONCOMPLIANCE.—

"(1) FUNDS WITHHELD ON OR BEFORE SEPTEMBER 30, 1994.—

"(A) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Any funds withheld under this section from apportionment to any State on or before September 30, 1994, shall remain available for apportionment to such State as follows:

"(i) If such funds would have been apportioned under section 104(b)(5)(A) of this title but for this section, such funds shall remain available until the end of the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

"(ii) If such funds would have been apportioned under section 104(b)(5)(B) of this title but for this section, such funds shall remain available until the end of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

"(iii) If such funds would have been apportioned under section 104(b)(1), 104(b)(2), or 104(b)(6) of this title but for this section, such funds shall remain available until the end of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

"(B) FUNDS WITHHELD AFTER SEPTEMBER 30, 1994.—No funds withheld under this section from apportionment to any State after September 30, 1994, shall be available for apportionment to such State.

"(2) APPORTIONMENT OF WITHHELD FUNDS AFTER COMPLIANCE.—If, before the last day of the period for which funds withheld under this section from apportionment are to remain available for apportionment to a State under paragraph (1), the State makes effective a law which is in compliance with subsection (a), the Secretary shall on the day following the effective date of such law apportion to such State the withheld funds re-

maining available for apportionment to such State.

"(3) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY OF SUBSEQUENTLY APPORTIONED FUNDS.—Any funds apportioned pursuant to paragraph (2) shall remain available for expenditure as follows:

"(A) Funds apportioned under section 104(b)(5)(A) of this title shall remain available until the end of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year in which such funds are so apportioned.

"(B) Funds apportioned under section 104(b)(1), 104(b)(2), 104(b)(5)(B), or 104(b)(6) of this title shall remain available until the end of the third fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year in which such funds are so apportioned.

Sums not obligated at the end of such period shall lapse or, in the case of funds apportioned under section 104(b)(5) of this title, shall lapse and be made available by the Secretary for projects in accordance with section 118(b) of this title.

"(4) EFFECT OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—If, at the end of the period for which funds withheld under this section from apportionment are available for apportionment to a State under paragraph (1), the State has not made effective a law which is in compliance with subsection (a), such funds shall lapse or, in the case of funds withheld from apportionment under section 104(b)(5) of this title, such funds shall lapse and be made available by the Secretary for projects in accordance with section 118(b) of this title.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

"(1) ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE.—The term 'alcoholic beverage' has the meaning such term has under section 158(c) of this title.

"(2) MOTOR VEHICLE.—The term 'motor vehicle' has the meaning such term has under section 154(b) of this title.

"(3) OPEN ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTAINER.—The term 'open alcoholic beverage container' means any bottle, can, or other receptacle—

"(A) which contains any amount of an alcoholic beverage; and

"(B)(i) which is open or has a broken seal, or

"(ii) the contents of which are partially removed.

"(4) PASSENGER AREA.—The term 'passenger area' shall be defined by the Secretary by regulation."

"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 1 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"159. Open container limitations."

MSGR. JOHN C. MASAKOWSKI
HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 25, 1990, a tribute was paid to Father John Masakowski, who had bestowed upon him the special honor of being named monsignor.

Monsignor Masakowski is a native of my hometown of Nanticoke. He attended Nanticoke High School and later graduated cum laude from St. Mary's College in Orchard Lake, MI. He received his degree in theology and was ordained into the priesthood on June 4, 1949, at St. Peter's Cathedral in Scranton.

Throughout the years and throughout the many parishes, Monsignor Masakowski has left his mark. A very kind and generous person, Monsignor Masakowski has brought people and communities together by organizing service groups.

In addition, his good works not only include helping his fellow man, but he has led the efforts to improve each of the parish churches at which he has served.

Monsignor Masakowski's devotion to his vocation has been an inspiration to all those whose lives he has touched. He has displayed tireless dedication and service to his congregations over the years and his community-minded spirit is an example we all should follow.

It is only fitting that he be honored and I know my colleagues join me in wishing him all the best for many years to come.

**DAN HERRON: DEDICATED
EDUCATOR**

HON. BART GORDON
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, Gallatin High School in Gallatin, TN, is losing a legend. Education in Tennessee is losing a man who has been a true leader for more than three decades.

Dan Herron is retiring after 28 years as principal at Gallatin High School; 28 years marked by accomplishments often unparalleled by any school in the State.

Mr. Herron came to Gallatin in 1962. The next decade was one of marked change throughout the State and country but Mr. Herron and his outstanding staff guided the school through without much of the turmoil that marred other schools.

He developed a reputation of being firm but fair, a policy that drew support from students, parents and the community.

That solid foundation of cooperation and community backing continued into the 1970's, as Gallatin High School became known as a bastion of both academic and athletic excellence.

In 1983, Gallatin High School received the Presidential Award of Excellence, ranking it among the top schools in the Nation. The school's students have reaped numerous academic honors on the State and national level. Its athletic teams have excelled in State competitions.

Others from across Tennessee point to the school as an example of how to assemble an outstanding staff, develop innovative programs for a myriad of students, and attract and keep community support for a wide spectrum of activities. Herron's ability to combine those three ingredients have produced the sound learning environment that makes Gallatin High School outstanding.

Mrs. Jerri Guthrie, a long-time educator, once said of Herron, "He seems to have a sense of what makes a good teacher and has hired a lot of good ones over the years."

Dr. Hal Hooper, whose six children graduated from Gallatin High School, noted, "He

gets the community involved and he should get a lot of credit for that."

Mr. Herron is leaving Gallatin High School, and education, for a position with a bank in the private sector. However, his abilities and innovations will not soon be forgotten.

He will continue to be loved and revered by his former students, faculty members, and parents. His legacy will live on in future Gallatin High School students who benefit from the school he helped build.

**A TRIBUTE TO HON. GEORGE
STEEH II**

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the distinct privilege of honoring a very close and dear friend who has recently retired as judge of the 41-B District Court in Mount Clemens, the Honorable George Steeh II.

While Judge Steeh is most recently concluding over 10 years of service on the bench as district judge, he will always be remembered for the compassion, decency, and, above all, fairness he brought with him into his relationships with other people.

The son of Lebanese immigrants, Judge Steeh was born in Mount Clemens in 1919. He completed his law degree from the University of Michigan after serving in the Pacific during World War II. In the 1950's, he formed the law firm of Neale, Steeh, & Hader, embarking upon his public career. At the same time he was raising a family of five children.

In the next dozen years, his path took him from successful Macomb County lawyer to distinguished elected representative in Lansing. There he served in the Michigan House of Representatives and Senate and was selected by the Detroit News, as one of Michigan's most effective legislators.

His political associations, however, did not stop there. In the early 1960's, as chair of the Macomb County Democratic Party, he helped forge the Democratic majorities that made Michigan one of the most progressive States in the Nation. He continued his active involvement with the Macomb County Bar Association and the State Board of Appeals. And in 1980, he was appointed to the position from which he now retires.

Mr. Speaker, over the years George Steeh has consistently illustrated the meaning of public service: to administer the law with compassion, to apply the truth with fairness. We in the Mount Clemens community are, indeed, deeply indebted to this fine individual. He has and will continue to be a touchstone for those of us privileged to know him.

**A TRIBUTE TO FATHER EDUARDO
LORENZO**

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to an outstanding humanitarian from my hometown of Flint, MI, Father Eduardo Lorenzo. Father Lorenzo is being honored by Our Lady of Guadalupe Parish on the 25th anniversary of his ordination on Saturday, January 19, 1991.

Since arriving from Cuba in 1961, Father Lorenzo has been instrumental to the growth and development of parishes for the Spanish-speaking community throughout the State of Michigan. He has devoted countless hours to counseling members of his congregation and has worked tirelessly to assist all segments of the community.

Father Lorenzo was born and educated in Havana, Cuba and worked at the Cuban Motor Co., a division of General Motors, for several years. In 1956, he entered the Seminary of the Good Shepherd in Havana, where he studied for 5 years until the Castro regime forced the closing of the seminaries.

In 1961, Father Lorenzo came to the United States and entered St. Maur's Seminary in South Union, KY. During the summer of 1964, he came to the Lansing Diocese of Michigan and assisted with the Spanish-speaking Apostolate at Cristo Rey Catholic Parish.

After efforts to return to Cuba for his ordination failed, Archbishop Evelio Dias of Havana granted permission for Father Lorenzo to be ordained in Lansing. On January 22, 1966, Father Lorenzo became the first Cuban refugee from the Castro revolution to be ordained in the Catholic Priesthood of Lansing.

Father Lorenzo came to the Flint area on December 6, 1966, when he was named administrator of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, to serve the growing Spanish-speaking Catholic community. Through his perseverance and efforts, Father Lorenzo was able to establish a large parish, and by 1973 the Hispanic community was able to move their congregation into a larger building. On April 14, 1973, the new structure for Our Lady of Guadalupe became the first Catholic church in Michigan built for and by the Hispanic community.

Wherever he has preached, Father Lorenzo has committed himself to serving God and the people of his community. He has been a very positive influence on me and an important part of my personal growth and formation. I am a better person for having known him, and Flint is certainly a better community for his presence.

A TRIBUTE TO THE 100TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF CONGREGATION
EMANU EL

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a wonderful celebration on February 2, marking the 100th anniversary of the Congregation Emanu El in San Bernardino. This gala provides the congregation an opportunity to rejoice in its history while allowing the community, State, and country to recognize the oldest Jewish community in southern California.

Congregation Emanu El's official charter was issued by the State of California on February 2, 1891. However, the diverse history of the congregation goes back to the 1850's when the first Jews arrived in the San Bernardino Valley. At this time, historical records indicate, religious services were held on major Jewish holy days in private homes and communal buildings. These early settlers also began to educate the young and establish businesses in the area.

In 1861, the Jewish community was given a piece of land as a cemetery. The Home of Eternity Cemetery, owned and operated by Congregation Emanu El, is now the oldest Jewish cemetery in southern California and is recognized as a State historical landmark.

Until the 1930's Congregation Emanu El was the only synagogue between Pasadena and Phoenix. Jews came together from the San Bernardino, Riverside, and Pomona area for religious, educational, and social activities. Today, the congregation has a membership of some 600 families who live and work in San Bernardino, Redlands, Colton, Grand Terrace, Rialto, Fontana, Riverside, the mountains, and high desert.

Since 1947, the congregation has been affiliated with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the national organization of reform synagogues, but has consistently followed a ritual form blending orthodox, conservative, and reform Jewish practice.

It is not known when the name Congregation Emanu El came into use. Rudolf Anker served as president of the congregation from 1881 to 1890, and was followed by I.R. Brunn. The first spiritual leader of the congregation was Rabbi Samuel Margolis who led the congregation in the 1920's. Jacob Alkow served as rabbi from 1932 to 1937, and Rabbi Norman Feldheym from 1937 to 1971 and as Rabbi Hillel Emeritus from 1971 to 1985. Rabbi Hillel Cohn has served as spiritual leader of the congregation since 1963. Congregation president Richard G. Simon is joined on the temple staff by director of education, Rabbi Tracy Guren Klirs, and Cantor Gregory Yraslow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and our colleagues in recognizing this marvelous historic occasion. Congregation Emanu El has a rich and wonderful history that is certainly worthy of recognition by the House of Representatives.

UNFAIR BANKING PRACTICES

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I received a copy of an excellent December 28, 1990, letter sent to President George Bush from Robert L. Chambless, Jr., chairman of the board of Hart County Bank & Trust Co., in Munfordville, KY, which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Bob Chambless has written about issues of great concern to the bankers of Kentucky and elsewhere in the Nation, specifically the unfair practices of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in its regulatory practices. Although this is a more serious time for the President and our Nation with the threat of war with Iraq imminent, Bob Chambless urges the White House to take a serious look at "a domestic issue of great importance to us both, the FDIC." He urges scrutiny of the FDIC regulatory treatment of all financial institutions and their depositors.

I urge my colleagues to read the excellent comments of this outstanding banker from Kentucky. The letter from Bob Chambless follows:

HART COUNTY BANK AND TRUST CO.,
Munfordville, KY, December 28, 1990.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
President, United States of America,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH: I know that you have your hands full with foreign affairs right now, but I wanted to mention a domestic issue of great importance to us both, the FDIC.

Our little country bank has assets of 26 million dollars and a capital ratio of over nine percent. We serve a county of approximately 14,000 persons, with agriculture as our main industry. Not only are we getting tired of paying for other people's mistakes; but also, we have had problems of our own in the past, due to agricultural land values declining, and, we weathered that storm without any outside help. I am hard pressed to see why we should continue to pay the bills for others' mistakes, and, we know that just the increase in FDIC assessments for 1991 will cost us in excess of \$20,000, which results in our paying over two months of our 1991 earnings to the FDIC for that coverage. The fact that the FDIC chooses to fully cover uninsured and unassessed foreign deposits of the big banks is so unfair it escapes me why it is permitted to continue.

I do not need to take you through a history of what brought about the current problems, but there are three key things which come to mind immediately:

1. The deregulation of interest rates paid on deposits.
2. The deregulation of the savings and loan industry.
3. The unwillingness to let national corporations; such as, Chrysler Corporation and Continental Illinois National Bank go under, if in fact, they were broke.

Had these organizations been permitted to collapse, it would have had an awakening effect on the public and on government; and, maybe some folks' eyes would have been opened a little wider towards the future.

Best of luck and prayers to you in your efforts to resolve the many problems confronting this country today.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT L. CHAMBLESS, Jr.,
Chairman of the Board.

THE MANZANAR NATIONAL
HISTORIC SITE

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would designate the World War II Manzanar internment camp a national historic site. Such a designation will create a permanent reminder of one of the darkest moments in our Nation's history. Our internment of Japanese-Americans during the Second World War was inexcusable and unconscionable.

Manzanar was the first of 10 internment camps to house the 120,000 persons of Japanese ancestry, most of them American citizens, who were forcibly removed from their homes in coastal areas between 1942 and 1945.

We cannot allow these grave injustices to be forgotten. The Manzanar site will help teach future generations the risks of suspending civil liberties, and be a longstanding reminder of what can happen if our national commitment to freedom waivers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure to preserve the historic record of the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II. I hope it will forever remind us of what can happen when we forget what this country stands for.

H.R. 543

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to provide for the protection and interpretation of historical and cultural resources associated with the relocation of Japanese-Americans during World War II, there is hereby established the Manzanar National Historic Site (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "site").

(b) AREA INCLUDED.—The site shall consist of the lands and interests in lands within the area generally depicted as Alternative 3 on map 3, as contained in the Study of Alternatives for Manzanar War Relocation Center, map number 80,002 and dated February 1989. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") may from time to time make minor revisions in the boundary of the site.

SEC. 2. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the site in accordance with this Act and with the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1-4) and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467).

(b) DONATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may

accept and expend donations of funds, property, or services from individuals, foundations, corporations, or public entities for the purpose of providing services and facilities which he deems consistent with the purposes of this Act.

(c) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH STATE.**—In administering the site, the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with public and private entities for management and interpretive programs within the site and with the State of California, or any political subdivision thereof, for the rendering, on a reimbursable basis, of rescue, firefighting, and law enforcement services and cooperative assistance by nearby law enforcement and fire preventive agencies.

(d) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH OWNERS.**—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the owners of properties of historical or cultural significance as determined by the Secretary, pursuant to which the Secretary may mark, interpret, improve, restore, and provide technical assistance with respect to the preservation and interpretation of such properties. Such agreements shall contain, but need not be limited to, provisions that the Secretary shall have the right of access at reasonable times to public portions of the property for interpretive and other purposes, and that no changes or alterations shall be made in the property except by mutual agreement.

(e) With respect to lands acquired by the United States pursuant to this Act, the Secretary shall permit movement of livestock across such lands in order to reach adjacent lands, if the party seeking to make such use of the acquired lands was authorized to make such use as of the date of enactment of this Act; but any such use shall be subject to such terms, conditions, and requirements as the Secretary may impose in order to protect the natural, cultural, historic, and other resources and values of the acquired lands.

SEC. 3. ACQUISITION OF LAND.

The Secretary may acquire land or interests in land, and improvements thereon, within the boundaries of the site by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

SEC. 4. ADVISORY COMMISSION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is hereby established the Manzanar National Historic Site Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Advisory Commission"). The Advisory Commission shall be composed of former internees of the Manzanar relocation camp, local residents, representatives of Native American groups, and the general public appointed by the Secretary to serve for terms of 2 years. Any member of the Advisory Commission appointed for a definite term may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor is appointed. The Advisory Commission shall designate one of its members as Chairman.

(b) **MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES.**—The Secretary, or his designee, shall from time to time, but at least semiannually, meet and consult with the Advisory Commission on matters relating to the development, management, and interpretation of the site.

(c) **MEETINGS.**—The Advisory Commission shall meet on a regular basis. Notice of meetings and agenda shall be published in local newspapers which have a distribution which generally covers the area affected by the site. Advisory Commission meetings shall be held at locations and in such a manner as to ensure adequate public involvement.

(d) **EXPENSES.**—Members of the Advisory Commission shall serve without compensation as such, but the Secretary may pay expenses reasonably incurred in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) **CHARTER.**—The provisions of section 14(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Act of October 6, 1972; 86 Stat. 776), are hereby waived with respect to this Advisory Commission.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The Advisory Commission shall terminate on 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as necessary to carry out this Act.

ANY WAR WITH IRAQ IS NOT SIMPLY ABOUT OIL

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, some very vocal opponents to U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf region keep insisting that an effort to maintain cheap oil is our only motivation. They chant: "No blood for oil."

They are very wrong. A New York Times editorial of January 15, 1991, addressed this subject as follows:

Those in the minority wholly opposed to war can best honor their cause by not caricaturing the views of the majority. To assert that the five-month-old gulf crisis is "only" about oil is as simple-minded as arguing that Saddam Hussein's rape of Kuwait is somehow less offensive because the emirate was not a democracy.

An opinion piece by Robert J. Samuelson printed in the Washington Post of January 16, 1991, entitled "Our Purpose in the Gulf," also very well addressed this false characterizations as follows:

Should it come, the war will not be about cheap oil—but about preventing oil power from being tragically misused. We have not sent nearly 400,000 Americans to the Persian Gulf to defend crude at \$18 a barrel. They are there to keep Saddam Hussein from controlling two-thirds of global oil reserves and from using that control to blackmail the industrial world and make Iraq a nuclear power.

The case for fighting Saddam now is, simply put, that he will be harder to fight later. And should last-minute diplomacy avert war, the success will be temporary unless it leads to effective measures to check Saddam's military strength and provide security in the Gulf.

Because war is so awful, we must be clear that our purpose is worthy. The stakes are more important than a few cents on gas prices or restoring the emir of Kuwait. Nor are we defending opposition to all aggression, no matter how brutal. A president who did that would be "impeached after the first crisis in which there were significant U.S. casualties," as Foreign Policy editor Charles William Maynes says. . . .

Mr. Speaker, this Member also wants to call to the attention of his colleagues a relevant excerpt from the statement of Secretary of State James A. Baker III, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on December 6,

1990. It may well be the best description or account of the reasons why American forces are deployed in the Persian Gulf area. It reads as follows:

It is often said that there has been no clear answer given to the question of why we are in the Gulf. Much of this results from the search for a single cause for our involvement, a single reason the President could use to explain why the lives of American men and women should be put in harm's way in the sands of Arabia or the seas around it and in the air above it.

Mr. Chairman, let us stop this search. Let us be honest with ourselves and with each other. There are multiple causes, multiple dangers, multiple threats. Standing alone, each is compelling. Put together, the case is overwhelming.

Put bluntly: A very dangerous dictator—armed to the teeth—is threatening a critical region at a defining moment in history.

It is the combination of these reasons—who is threatening our interests, what capabilities he has and is developing, where he is carrying out aggression, and when he has chosen to act—that makes the stakes so high for all of us.

Let me explain.

Strategically, Saddam is a capricious dictator whose lust for power is as unlimited as his brutality in pursuit of it. He has invaded two neighbors, is harboring terrorists, and now is systematically exterminating Kuwait. Saddam uses poisonous gas—even against his own people; develops deadly toxins; and seeks relentlessly to acquire nuclear bombs. He has built the world's sixth largest army, has the world's fifth largest tank army, and has deployed ballistic missiles.

Geographically, Saddam's aggression has occurred in a political tinderbox that is crossroads to three continents. His success would only guarantee more strife, more conflict, and eventually a wider war. There would be little hope for any effort at peace-making in the Middle East.

Economically, Saddam's aggression imperils the world's oil lifelines, threatening recession and depression, here and abroad, hitting hardest those fledgling democracies least able to cope with it. His aggression is an attempt to mortgage the economic promise of the post-Cold War world to the whims of a single man.

Morally, we must act so that international laws, not international outlaws, govern the post-Cold War world. We must act so that right, not might, dictates success in the post-Cold War world. We must act so that innocent men and women and diplomats are protected, not held hostage, in the post-Cold War world.

Historically, we must stand with the people of Kuwait so that the annexation of Kuwait does not become the first reality that mars our vision of a new world order. We must stand with the world community so that the United Nations does not go the way of the League of Nations.

Politically, we must stand for American leadership, not because we seek it but because no one else can do the job. And we did not stand united for forty years to bring the Cold War to a peaceful end in order to make the world safe for the likes of Saddam Hussein.

These then are the stakes.

If Saddam is not stopped now, if his aggressive designs are not frustrated, peacefully if possible, or if necessary by force, we will all pay a higher price later.

IRAQ CRISIS RESOLUTIONS

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I have sat through nearly 50 hours of testimony in the House Armed Services Committee, and through the entire discussion on the House floor about United States options to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. I regret that Members have only had the chance to discuss, instead of debate, an issue of such magnitude in this democratic body. This is truly unfortunate, because many inaccuracies have gone unchallenged in the past 2 days.

We all have the right to form our own opinions, but facts are facts. I would like to submit some materials for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which address issues that have been discussed to ensure that the American people have adequate information on which to base their own opinions.

Members have repeatedly cited CIA Director William Webster's testimony as justification for continued sanctions. I noted 15 different interpretations of his statements during floor discussions, with many concluding that sanctions would remove Hussein from Kuwait in the near future. I would like to point out the following statement from Mr. Webster's letter of January 10, 1991, addressing this subject. His conclusion is, and I quote, there is "no evidence that sanctions would mandate a change in Saddam Hussein's behavior and that there was no evidence when or even if they would force him out of Kuwait."

Members have also asserted that the defensive effort in Saudi Arabia is purely an American one. I have repeatedly called on the administration to solicit greater support from some allies, such as Germany and Japan, that can afford to do more. However, there are many nations contributing significant financial and military resources to this effort, and they should not go unnoticed.

I would like to highlight one of the most glaring omissions from this discussion—and that is the fact that there are roughly 90,000 allied Arab soldiers located on the border between Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, of the 245,000 international troops committed to this effort; 33,000 Kuwaitis who managed to escape are also contributing to this military coalition. There are no American troops within 60 kilometers of the border. I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point a memo from National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft fully outlining all military support, and a chart illustrating allied troop commitments in the Persian Gulf.

On a related note, many are stating that the United States is bearing the full cost of the military effort in the gulf. Again, I would refer to Mr. Scowcroft's memo outlining allied contributions. In a recent letter, Saudi Arabian Ambassador Bandar bin Sultan assured us that his nation is losing money as a result of the Desert Shield embargo. The Saudis have given U.S. troops carte blanche coverage of costs for food, water, construction, transportation, and fuel, and they have handed over entire facilities for exclusive U.S. use, including a brand-new airfield. Saudi Arabia has

also provided \$3.65 billion in economic assistance to neighboring Arab allies who have suffered as a result of the embargo, and they have forgiven over \$4 billion in Egyptian debts. I urge my colleagues to read Bandar bin Sultan's letter outlining Saudi contributions, and remind them to keep in mind his conclusion, that "After taking into account both higher revenues and higher expenditures resulting from the crisis, a clear Saudi budget deficit results."

The focal point of recent debate has been the length of time it will take for sanctions to succeed. Many witnesses before the Armed Services Committee expressed a desire to give sanctions a chance to work, and optimism that they could. But no one person could say with confidence how long it would take to make sanctions work, or that they ever would. I would like to share some of the more compelling statements on sanctions from a broad-based group of sources, many who testified before the Armed Services Committee.

The Washington Post reports that the sanctions are working like a "loose-meshed fishing net." "The borders are extremely porous," states a Western diplomat in Iraq. Said another foreign official, "I suppose if the sanctions continued for some years, they would eventually have an effect." the bottom line is and I quote "the sanctions have failed to create widespread shortages [in Iraq]."

Jerrold Post, M.D., psychiatry and political psychology, Geo. Washington University: "He will only reverse his present course if his power and reputation are threatened. This requires a posture of strength, firmness and clarity of purpose by a unified, civilized world, demonstrably willing to use force if necessary. The only language Saddam Hussein understands is the language of power. Without this demonstrable willingness to use force, even if the sanctions are biting deeply, Saddam is quite capable of putting his population through a sustained period of hardship, as he has in the past ***. It is a certainty that he will return at a later date, stronger than ever, unless firm measures are taken to contain him."

(Post said the possibility of sanctions working in a year was "iffy" in response to questions.)

Phebe Marr, senior fellow with National Defense University, gulf expert: "[Sanctions], in my view, will be a long, slow process that will be difficult to detect and possible for Saddam to contain, given his control over his populace. Support for Saddam, especially among his armed forces, can also be eroded by a credible military threat which, while riskier, is likely to end the crisis sooner."

(She also said that Hussein believes that America lacks the stomach for a military fight, and that this belief must be dispelled before we can get him to move from waiting out the sanctions to leaving Kuwait.)

William Webster, Director of Central Intelligence: "Our judgment has been, and continues to be, that there is no assurance or guarantee that economic hardships will compel Saddam to change his policies or lead to internal unrest that would threaten his regime."

"Saddam's willingness to sit tight and try to outlast the sanctions or, in the alternative, to avoid war by withdrawing from Kuwait will be determined by his total assessment of the political, economic and military pressures arrayed against him."

Jeane Kirkpatrick, former U.N. Ambassador: "I fear that Iraq can withstand sanctions longer than the rest of us can be relied upon to sustain them."

"I have never proposed the use of force to solve an international problem until now. I am reluctantly persuaded by Saddam Hussein's character, his record, and his record that there may be no alternative solution."

Joe Sisco, former Undersecretary of State: Two flaws with sanctions: (1) will not hurt in the right places, (2) no way that Iraqi citizen's sacrifices will translate into action against Saddam. The longer he can resist sanctions, the more of a hero he becomes in Arab community's eyes.

Congressman Bill Gray said on national news today it will take three to four years for economic sanctions against Iraq to work.

Colonel Dupuy, former Army officer, military analyst: "Waiting for sanctions to work is really avoiding war, and thus disastrous."

In recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Dr. Henry Kissinger told Senator SAM NUNN that by the time we discover that sanctions are not likely to work, "it may be too late." He stated further that "I do not believe that we will see a day where the Iraqi leader will send us a letter saying he has now accepted our terms."

In short, these comments underscore the fact that sanctions cannot guarantee success. Even many who stand on this floor in support of sanctions admit that eventually force may have to be used. What they don't acknowledge is the fact that our forces may lose their edge over time, that we may lose allied military support over time, or get drawn into a conflict far greater than our present limited mission.

There are several other factors which might limit allied forces' ability to effectively resolve this crisis over time, including the Arab holy days, the weather, the potential splintering of coalition support over time and the fact that Kuwait as a nation might be completely destroyed if we wait too long to force Hussein out. Unfortunately, the more time Hussein gets, the more time he has to force the Palestinian question onto the international agenda and to build his standing in the Arab world.

Mr. Speaker, despite the intensity of debate, we all agree on our goal. No one wants war, we all seek peace. The debate is really one of timing. But that is critical, because timing may make the difference between success and failure. I have one nephew serving in the gulf, and one ready to deploy, and share the desire of all Americans for a speedy, peaceful resolution to this crisis.

In closing, I would like to share a quote made by former British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain in 1938. Speaking of the German march through Europe, he said:

How horrible, fantastic, incredible, it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas-masks here because of a quarrel in a faraway country between people of who we know nothing.

Mr. Speaker, two days later Mr. Chamberlain announced that the Munich agreement gave his nation "peace with honor *** peace in our time." Eleven months later Great Britain was engaged in a desperate war of survival against Hitler's Germany.

Make no mistake about it. Desire for peace does not warrant appeasement. We must

stand strong in the face of Hussein's brutal aggression, and ensure that our efforts secure peace not just today but in the future.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, January 10, 1991.

Memorandum for the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Director, Office of Management and Budget, the Director of Central Intelligence, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of the United States Information Agency.

Subject: Administration Public Position on Sharing of Responsibility for the Coalition Effort in the Persian Gulf.

Having received agency comments, we have prepared the paper, attached at Tab A, describing the Administration's public position on what other countries have done to share the responsibility for the coalition effort in the Gulf. This guidance should form a common base within the USG for discussions of this issue with the public, the press, and with the Congress. You should feel free to deploy this material immediately in whatever way you feel will be most effective.

BRENT SCOWCROFT.

SHARING OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE COALITION EFFORT IN THE PERSIAN GULF

Many other countries are doing their part to support the coalition effort in the Persian Gulf. Looking only at what has been accomplished so far, in calendar year 1990, our partners in the coalition have contributed in three ways:

First, 28 other countries have their own military forces in the Persian Gulf, in Saudi Arabia, and in the Gulf states. They have now committed more than 245,000 troops, 64 warships, over 650 combat aircraft, and more than 950 tanks to the multinational coalition facing Iraq. Turkey has also significantly enhanced its defense capabilities opposite Iraq.

Second, they have given money and other assistance to us for our Operation Desert Shield expenses. Our incremental costs for the operation were roughly \$10 billion in calendar year 1990. We have already received \$6 billion in cash and in-kind support from our allies to defray these costs. We expect to soon receive an additional \$2 billion more that has already been pledged to meet these 1990 costs. With these sums, and assuming Congress enacts the necessary appropriation, our coalition partners will have covered some 80% of our incremental expenses through December 31, 1990.

Third, they have taken on the responsibility for assisting those nations which have suffered the most from the effects of the international economic sanctions against Iraq. The Gulf Crisis Financial Coordination Group established by President Bush has received pledges of \$13.5 billion for exceptional economic assistance for these hard-hit states, of which nearly \$6 billion has already been disbursed.

These are the figures for last year. As costs for CY 1991 occur, we will look to our allies to shoulder their fair share of our military expenses and exceptional economic assistance efforts.

Other Countries' Military Forces in the Gulf: Twenty-nine countries, including the U.S., have joined forces in responding to the crisis in the Gulf. In general, given their limited capabilities to support large-scale force deployments, other states have contributed what they can and what we have asked.

Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the other GCC states have deployed their armed forces.

Egypt has sent an armored division, a mechanized division, and a Ranger regiment—hundreds of armored vehicles and more than 25,000 troops, with thousands more en route. Syria, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Morocco, and other Muslim states also have put tens of thousands of soldiers in the field.

Britain is deploying a heavy armored division and has sent more than 70 combat aircraft, a total of over 30,000 soldiers and airmen. Eight French regiments are in place too, along with over 130 combat aircraft.

Canada and Italy have sent combat aircraft to the Gulf; Czechoslovakia has deployed a chemical decontamination unit.

Turkey has substantially strengthened its defenses opposite Iraq and NATO approved the unprecedented dispatch of its rapid deployment units—German, Belgian, and Italian planes—to help this Alliance member.

Fourteen navies now have fighting vessels patrolling the waters of the Gulf. Our coalition partners have stopped and boarded hundreds of ships to enforce the UN's economic sanctions.

Help For Operation Desert Shield: Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) are providing substantial cash and host nation support. Host nation support includes food, fuel, water, facilities, and local transport for U.S. forces. In addition, Saudi Arabia is committed to funding transportation for our forces in Europe and the U.S. to the Gulf from the start of the second deployment in October.

Japan has contributed substantial cash and in-kind support, including support for transport costs and purchases of U.S.-made computers, vehicles and construction equipment. The Japanese Diet recently appropriated the second \$1 billion allotment of Japan's promised \$2 billion contribution to the multinational defense effort. Germany has provided cash and in-kind support, including heavy equipment transporters and other valuable equipment from existing stocks, such as 60 modern chemical detection vehicles. Germany has also provided extensive support for the movement of U.S. forces from Europe to the Gulf. Korea has provided cash and lift support since the earliest days of the operation.

Exceptional Economic Assistance: With our own resources concentrated on the military effort against Iraq, we organized the international effort to provide financial assistance to those nations most hard-hit by the crisis and sanctions. Our partners in this effort have made commitments amounting to \$13.5 billion for assistance to front-line states and other countries. Nearly six billion dollars of this total has already been disbursed. Our Arab partners, Germany, Japan, and the European Community have been leading contributors and we look to them and other countries to accelerate the disbursement of funds already committed and make additional commitments. Additionally, in response to President Bush's proposals and with strong support from other creditor countries, the IMF and World Bank moved swiftly to adapt their lending procedures to enable them to alleviate more effectively the economic effects of the crisis on a wide range of countries.

The Facts on Windfall Profits: Reports of windfall profiteering made against our coalition partners from the Arab Gulf are misleading. For example, Saudi Arabia's increased revenue so far due to the increase in oil prices comes to about \$13-15 billion. Saudi Arabia's Gulf crisis-related expenditures are estimated to be running ahead of their increased revenues. Saudi crisis-related

expenditures include host nation support to coalition forces, aid to front line and other affected nations, increased Saudi military expenditures and arms purchases, and investment to expand oil production capacity.

More Needs to be Done: The contributions in 1990 were substantial and, in most cases, countries committed what we requested. We are working now to:

Ensure, in Desert Shield, prompt disbursement of remaining funds and secure new commitments to cover incremental costs in 1991; and

For the front line states, accelerate disbursements of previous commitments of economic assistance, particularly for Turkey, and obtain new commitments for the front line states and for Eastern Europe to help cover the emerging economic costs of the sanctions.

COUNTRIES INVOLVED IN RESPONSIBILITY-SHARING

Providing Military Forces

Argentina (naval).
Australia (naval).
Bahrain (ground, air).
Bangladesh (ground).
Belgium (air—in Turkey, naval).
Canada (air, naval).
Czechoslovakia (ground).
Denmark (naval).
Egypt (ground).
France (ground, air, naval).
Germany (air—in Turkey, naval).
Greece (naval).
Italy (air, naval).
Kuwait (ground, air, naval).
Morocco (ground).
Netherlands (naval).
New Zealand (air).
Niger (ground).
Norway (naval).
Oman (ground, air).
Pakistan (ground, naval).
Qatar (ground, air).
Saudi Arabia (ground, air, naval).
Senegal (ground).
Spain (naval).
Syria (ground).
United Arab Emirates (ground, air).
United Kingdom (ground, air, naval).

Assistance to Operation Desert Shield

Germany, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, (plus transit rights from numerous states and aid in moving forces from others, including Denmark, Greece, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, Poland, and Turkey).

Exceptional Economic Assistance for Front-Line States

Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, European Commission (for the EC), Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, and United Kingdom.

THE CRISIS IN THE BALTICS

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, last July, the Baltic Republics commemorated the 50th anniversary of their forced incorporation into the Soviet Union. In a joint declaration to mark the

occasion, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia called July 21, 1940 a day of "injury, humiliation, and tragedy." Sadly, that was not the last day Soviet power would inflict harm to the peoples of the Baltic Republics. For nearly 50 years, their national identities and their sovereignty had been subjugated to the will of the Kremlin.

With the ascension to power in the Soviet Union of Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985, the promise of a more open, reformed, and tolerant society was born. In due course, Soviet military power and political control receded from Eastern Europe. This brought the cold war between East and West to a stunning and unexpectedly rapid conclusion. In the Soviet Union itself, genuine democratic reformers have struggled with those resisting change. Free and competitive elections have raised alternative voices to those of the Communist Party to positions of power. In the Baltics, those elections ratified the evident will of the people. The Baltic peoples have expressed themselves clearly and unequivocally that they desire to be free.

Since Lithuania first declared itself independent from Soviet rule in March 1990, Moscow and the breakaway republics have been on a collision course. Violence has already come to Azerbaijan and Georgia. In the last few days, the most serious, violent, and sinister repression of popular nationalist sentiment has occurred in Lithuania.

To date, 14 unarmed civilians have been killed in violent clashes in Vilnius and there are disturbing indications that the pattern of violence that has taken place in Lithuania might be repeated elsewhere in the Baltics.

The emergence of a Committee of National Salvation in Lithuania, inspired and created by the small pro-Moscow faction of the Lithuanian Communist Party, is disturbing evidence that not all Soviets accept the principles of an open society and that some are prepared to use force to retain control. The tragic events in Lithuania in the last few days are reminiscent of classic Soviet tactics, dating to the Bolshevik Revolution and refined by Josef Stalin, to expand and retain Soviet power. Today, President Gorbachev unfortunately suggested that the situation in the Baltics might require the suspension of press freedoms—freedoms which were guaranteed just last June.

I join with those who call upon the Soviet leadership to refrain from further violence in the Baltics, to seek a peaceful resolution of the problems there, and to continue with the paths of glasnost and perestroika. If the Soviet Union is to continue on the path of reform and democratization, the Baltics will be a critical test. The Soviet Union cannot expect that the improved relationship with the West, and, in particular, the United States, which has been so beneficial to all our peoples, can continue with the violent extinguishing of the aspirations of the Baltic peoples.

HEALTH CRISIS NETWORK'S AIDS WALK MIAMI

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Health Crisis Network of greater Miami [HCN] will be sponsoring the third annual AIDS Walk Miami on February 24, 1991, to raise much needed funds for HCN and other community based AIDS assistance organizations.

The Health Crisis Network is a not-for-profit community service concerned solely with the AIDS epidemic and its impact upon the Miami community. Founded in 1983 by a small group of volunteers concerned about the lack of needed services for people living with AIDS, HCN has grown to serve more than 2,300 people.

Men, women, and children from all walks of life are drawn to this event as a means of expressing their hope, compassion and determination in the face of AIDS. In the past, this event has attracted approximately 1,200 walkers and 5,000 contributors. Funds raised will go specifically to the support services for people living with AIDS, HIV infection, their families and loved ones. The funds will also be used to finance HCN's outstanding AIDS prevention/education campaign, as well as to intensify the role HCN plays in the drive to increase Government funding for AIDS research, education, and services.

Special recognition must be given to the organizers of this event: Catherine G. Lynch, executive director of HCN; Tony Valido, Walk chair; and Dr. Carmen Marina, public relations committee. Also deserving of recognition is the board of directors: Betty Alvarez, Gregory A. Baldwin, Larry Bloch, Samuel S. Blum, Russell Corbett, Rachel Dykes, Douglas Feldman, Sam Gentry, Barbara T. Gray, Robert Longstreth, Yvonne McCullough, A. Richard Pollock, Miguel Reyes, Lee Schrager, Mark S. Stienberg, Tony Valido, Frank Wager, Richard F. Wolfson, Jose Valdes-Fauli, and Rudy Molinet.

I commend the work of the Health Crisis Network and through their efforts Miami, as well as the rest of the Nation, will beat this terrible disease.

NEED TO EXTEND HOMEOWNER PROGRAM

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the mortgage revenue bond program is the only Federal assistance generally available to first-time home buyers at a time when home ownership rates are declining. Yet, at a time when families of modest incomes need more help than ever, this important program is scheduled to expire at the end of this year.

According to figures recently released by the U.S. Census Bureau, the national rate of home ownership declined from 65.6 percent in

1980 to 63.9 percent in 1989, the first decade-long decline since the 1930's. And a Harvard University study estimates that even with a 10-percent downpayment, only 14.5 percent of renters age 24 to 34 would qualify for a conventional mortgage loan.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has chosen to extend this program each of the four times it was scheduled to expire during the last decade, and an overwhelming majority of the House cosponsored legislation in the 101st Congress to extend the program. I believe, given its support, it is time to make this important home ownership program a permanent part of the Tax Code.

TRIBUTE TO LEWIS A. SHATTUCK

HON. RONALD K. MACHTELEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. MACHTELEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lewis A. Shattuck, president of the Small Business Association of New England. Mr. Shattuck is retiring from the organization.

Lewis Shattuck has been a role model for the small business community. Respected on the Federal, State, and local levels of government, Lewis played an instrumental role in the organization and passage of the White House Conference on Small Business. Not only is Lewis Shattuck active in the National Small Business United, he is also active on the National Advisory Council of the U.S. Small Business Administration.

Under Lewis' leadership, the Washington presentation has grown to include companies from across the country. The Small Business Association of New England has grown from a staff of 2 and a membership of 300, to a staff of 12 and a membership approaching 2,000. This is a direct result of Lewis Shattuck's diligence.

It is with great pleasure that I salute Mr. Lewis Shattuck for his outstanding achievements for small business, the backbone of our country's economy. I wish him a happy retirement and continued success in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN R. "JACK" GRAF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a very special man, a great friend of the community who has dedicated well over 35 years of his life to education. John R. "Jack" Graf is retiring as Yolo County superintendent of schools, a post he has held since 1983.

Jack's involvement in education and in the community began long before he held the superintendent post. In fact, he has taken on many different roles in his years with the school system: teacher, coach, athletic director, department chair, vice principal, principal, and countless others that are without title: chaplain, counselor, confidant, advisor, mentor.

Jack has filled these many different roles in a number of different places. From 1956 to 1960, he was a teacher, coach, and department chair at Yuba High School. From 1960 to 1963, Jack was in Courtland as their teacher, coach, athletic director, vice principal. From 1973 to 1964, he served as the vice principal of El Dorado High School in Placerville. In 1964, Vanden High School opened at Travis Air Force Base and Jack was their first principal. He stayed there until 1967, when El Dorado High wanted him back as their principal. Jack remained there as principal until 1975 when he left to be principal of Winters High. After a year as principal at Winters, he became superintendent of Winters Unified School District; he was superintendent from 1976 to 1982. From 1983 until now he has been the Yolo County superintendent of schools.

Being a very innovative educational leader with a great deal of creative vision, Jack has not confined his actions within the schools to merely teaching and administrative duties. He has helped develop many wonderful programs from which students benefit greatly. Among these are AIDS education, drug and alcohol awareness, the academic decathlon, and the Yolo County Career Fair. Jack has been concerned with reaching and helping educate those who do not fit within the confines of the usual education system. He has been extremely instrumental in the creation and development of such outreach programs as Yolo County Regional Occupation Program, Special Education, Teenage Parent Education, Midtown Alternative Education, as well as model programs for Juvenile Hall and Adult Education at the Yolo County Jail. Jack has never shunned those whose needs were different; he has worked diligently in mainstreaming handicapped students. Jack has always been concerned with those considered high risk. His willingness to reach out to those and see to their education only testify to the great academic leader and very caring person Jack is. The comprehensive board-administrative policy manual Jack developed for the Yolo County Office of Education serves as a statewide model for California School Board Association and reflects these many concerns of reaching the many educational needs of students.

Jack has recognized that student interest is not solely confined to academics. He chaired the California Intercollegiate Federation Study Committee for the Sacramento-San Joaquin section, which regionalized high school athletic playoffs. He likewise realized that interest in education is not limited to educators. He continuously reaches out and attempts to draw schools and the community even closer together. He has served as the education representative to the Yolo County Private Industry Council and assisted the Community Partnership Agency develop a proposal to fund the Business Labor Council.

Jack is recognized by the community and by his peers in education for his caring commitment and outstanding leadership abilities. He is a member of the capitol service region of California Association of County Superintendents of Schools and sits on their legislative committee and State directorship. Jack is also a member of the Association of California School Administrators, sitting on the legislative

action and on the superintendency committees as well as former president of their Yolo County chapter.

In serving the community outside of his educational contributions, Jack has somehow found time to be a member of Rotary International, the Winters, Woodland, and Yolo County Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, the Yolo County Business and Professional Women's Organization, and the Yolo County Detachment Marine Corps League.

Jack has so long been a great part of the school system and of the community, that his name is simply synonymous with education in Yolo County. Few are held in such high esteem or as deservedly so as Jack. Even more so, he is regarded with warm affection for not just being a great leader, but also a great friend of the community. Jack is respected because his commitment to education and to the community is not only expressed by his words but also by his actions. His efforts to improve education are tireless and his contributions are ceaseless. For that he not only commands the admiration and respect of Yolo County but also has the deepest gratitude and heartfelt affection of its residents. Jack certainly has my appreciation for all he has done. It is with warmest regards that I congratulate my dear friend upon his retirement.

THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF HUNGARIAN ORGANIZATIONS IN NORTH AMERICA

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have lent their valuable time and resources to the cause of democracy in Eastern and central Europe. For years, if not for decades, scores of dedicated individuals in the United States, with their friends and colleagues in Canada and elsewhere, fought to keep the dream of freedom alive in the East bloc countries, despite the many, frustrating setbacks which argued for giving up. Their vigilant efforts not only kept the dream of freedom alive, they helped to make the dream become reality in the miraculous wave of political pluralism which swept through the countries of Eastern and central Europe in 1989 and into 1990.

The members of the Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America are prime examples of these determined individuals. I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words about the admirable work of this organization, which decided to cease its activities last October, having concluded that, after one quarter of a century of tireless effort, its goals had finally and successfully been achieved.

As Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, often called the Helsinki Commission, I have had the pleasure in the past to work closely with the Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America, a consultative body of 15 major Hungarian organizations in the United States and Canada. I know that a number of other Members of the Congress maintained

similar contacts with the Coordinating Committee over the years. The Committee's executive secretary, Istvan Gereben, has been a special asset to the Commission and to the Congress with the information and insight he has provided on developments in Hungary and in Eastern and central Europe as a whole. Whether it meant testifying before a congressional committee, preparing background documentation for use at CSCE meetings, or arranging meetings for visiting activists from Hungary, the Coordinating Committee could be relied upon to keep us informed. As just one example, I remember well the excellent and timely materials the Coordinating Committee provided the Helsinki Commission prior to its visit to Hungary in 1986, the first permitted for the Commission by that or any other Warsaw Pact country.

Many of the Coordinating Committee's members, today American and Canadian citizens, were citizens of Hungary 35 years ago, when that country first sought to break from the communist repression imposed on it since the end of the Second World War. That effort—the Hungarian Revolution of 1956—was brutally crushed by the Soviet Union. Imre Nagy and other leaders of the revolution were executed, and thousands of Hungarian freedom fighters were either imprisoned or fled the country. Many of them came to this country, where they found new lives and contributed enormously to our own society, but they neither forgot nor gave up on their original homeland. While the Soviet tanks rumbling down the streets of Budapest represented a crushing blow, for these men and women the struggle had only just begun.

Along with their fellow Hungarians already living abroad, these individuals organized and pressed Western governments to encourage democratic change in Hungary. Over time, much positive change did occur, especially following the signing of the Helsinki Final Act in 1975. The final act, as a common yardstick for measuring the human rights performance of its signatories, became a particularly timely and useful rallying point for human rights advocates in both East and West. The Coordinating Committee, along with other nongovernmental organizations concerned with human rights, strongly supported the establishment of the Helsinki Commission by the Congress in 1976, with a mandate to monitor and encourage compliance with the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent CSCE documents.

As Hungary's Communists, led by Janos Kadar, instituted political and economic reforms in what became popularly known as goulash communism, many saw in Hungary the best that a Communist state dominated by the Soviet Union could ever hope to be. While an increasing number argued that, as a reward for improved performance, Hungary should no longer be subjected to public criticism for its human rights record and should, in fact, be granted additional economic concessions, the Coordinating Committee and its members argued against this complacency, stressing forcefully that implementation of Helsinki commitments could be improved further, and that liberalization under the direction of a party which maintains a monopoly on political power fell far short of a democracy.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we can see that much more was possible. In March 1990, Hungary held its first free elections in more than 40 years, bringing into power a parliament and government dedicated to strengthening the democracy which now exists. In announcing that its work had come to an end, the Coordinating Committee concluded that:

*** the goal of its activities—the fulfillment of the demands of the 1956 Revolution—has been achieved. The inauguration of a democratically elected, free Parliament, and of government which is responsible to the Parliament and committed to the full recognition and implementation of political and human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the Helsinki Final Act, ended a period in Hungary's history marked with brutal repression and foreign control of mind and territory. Freedom, democracy and independence are established.

The members of the Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America, Mr. Speaker, are to be commended for their hard work over the years, and congratulated on the successful result. They are an inspiration to us all. Their tireless efforts have contributed not only to the reestablishment of democracy in Hungary, but to the strengthening of American democracy as well. The enormous depth of their commitment to human rights reminds us of the freedoms we enjoy—freedoms to speak as we please, and worship which were also attained by only after a long struggle but which today we often take for granted. In this regard, Istvan Gereben and the other members of the Coordinating Committee have overfulfilled their assigned task, and we owe them our most heart-felt thanks and best wishes as they continue individually or in other organizations, as we know they will, to help Hungarian democracy and our own to grow and prosper.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Coordinating Committee's resolution on fulfilling its mandate be printed in the RECORD in full.

STATEMENT OF COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF HUNGARIAN ORGANIZATIONS IN NORTH AMERICA

The Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America at its semi-annual meeting held on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of its existence and the 34th anniversary of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution passed the following resolution:

The Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America has concluded that the goal of its activities: the fulfillment of the demands of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution has been achieved. The inauguration of a democratically elected free Parliament and government which is responsible to this Parliament and committed to the full recognition and implementation of political and human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the Helsinki Final Act ended a period in Hungary's history marked with brutal oppression and foreign control of mind and territory. Freedom, democracy and independence are established.

The Committee recognizes the fact that after the parliamentary and local elections held recently in Hungary its mandate drawn from the will of the Hungarian people freely expressed during the 1956 Revolution was no longer in effect. With the termination of its mandate the Coordinating Committee of

Hungarian Organizations in North America ceases its activities.

The Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America has come to this decision in the full knowledge that its members and its member organizations will not escape the universal Hungarian responsibility of furthering democracy in Hungary and will continue to serve the cause of freedom and human rights with renewed commitment and within organizational structures which accommodate the present needs and the new circumstances.

GOOD NEWS FOR DRUG WAR:
MEDELLIN DRUG LORD GIVES UP

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, today we learned that the No. 2 man in the Medellin cocaine cartel, the infamous Jorge Luis Ochoa, has surrendered outside Medellin, Colombia, on the heels of the surrender last month of his younger brother, Fabio, also a cartel leader.

This comes as welcome news to those of us who have been working closely with Colombian officials to bring an end to drug trafficking by this violent drug trafficking cartel. The Medellin cartel is responsible for killing hundreds of policemen and other officials in Colombia and for sending hundreds of tons of cocaine to the United States.

Last week, several of my colleagues and I who serve on the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control traveled to Colombia where we met with President Cesar Gaviria and key members of his Cabinet. President Gaviria spoke convincingly of his commitment to the fight against drug trafficking and his determination to track down and put drug traffickers in Colombia out of business. He specifically outlined his policy of instituting a strong, competent judicial system as a means of fulfilling this commitment.

To the credit of President Gaviria, the Ochoa brothers were convinced to surrender, with the assurance that they would be prosecuted under new stronger court procedures in Colombia rather than extradited to the United States. They turned themselves in to Colombian authorities knowing that the Colombian Government would not give up in its attempts to capture them and that they might be killed.

It has been estimated that Ochoa's personal wealth exceeds \$2 billion. If he had thought there was any way possible that he could have bought or fought his way out, he no doubt would have taken advantage of that option. Yet he obviously felt he had no viable option but to surrender, thereby demonstrating that President Gaviria's policies are working.

I hope that the cartel's top leader, Pablo Escobar Gaviria, who is still a fugitive, will also see the wisdom of surrendering to Colombian authorities.

Unfortunately, dismantling the Medellin cartel will not bring an abrupt halt to drug trafficking in Colombia. But if the Ochoa brothers receive and serve a proper sentence, this will demonstrate the continuing return to health of a civilized order in Colombia. Furthermore, it

will show that the joint efforts of the United States and Colombian Governments to curb drug trafficking are making progress. The Colombian Government needs and deserves our continued support in this difficult job.

REPRESSION IN LITHUANIA

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, the so-called National Salvation Committee of the Soviet Union has used military force to repress demonstrations advocating freedom and independence for Lithuania. More than a dozen Lithuanians have been killed.

Although the world is understandably preoccupied with events in the Persian Gulf, the crisis in Lithuania cannot—and should not—be ignored. This is true not only for humanitarian reasons, but because the Soviet Union's ability to cope rationally with demands for independence from the Baltic States and other nationalities may prove more important in the long run even than war in the Gulf.

The ability of the United States to influence Soviet policies toward those demanding greater freedom from Moscow is limited. But we ought to make clear our belief in the right of Lithuania and the other Baltic States to independence; we ought to urge Soviet leaders to resist the temptation to use military force; and we ought to warn Soviet leaders that their actions now will have a significant impact on the future relationship between our two countries.

Accordingly, I urge the President to speak out more strongly against Soviet-sponsored repression in Lithuania; to withhold economic credits granted to the Soviet Union if that repression continues; and to urge Soviet leaders to exercise restraint in dealing with other national and minority groups in the weeks and months ahead.

THE SOVIET CRACKDOWN IN
LITHUANIA

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged over the brutal Soviet repression of the Lithuanian independence movement and the recent violence that was instigated by the Soviet military in Vilnius. News reports describing the 14 civilian demonstrators' deaths by gunfire and tanks in the January 13 crackdown only fueled my anger.

The situation is especially maddening because Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has expressed no remorse or accountability for the military's heinous actions. Nor has President Gorbachev denied that he ordered the crackdown. Although it is still unclear whether Mikhail Gorbachev was directly responsible for the crackdown, he should have immediately renounced these tactics. His lack of remorse

and possible role in the crackdown is particularly egregious in light of the fact that he was recently awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

In addition, evidence is pointing to the likelihood that the Lithuanian crackdown is part of a larger Kremlin strategy to create the impression that two popular groups are vying for power in Lithuania in order for President Gorbachev to impose direct rule. The recent emergence of the National Salvation Committee, a pro-Moscow organization being used as a front for soliciting the intervention of the Soviet military, only reinforces these ominous signs. Other indications are appearing that the Kremlin was preparing to followup the crackdown in Lithuania with similar actions in the other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia.

While most of the world's attention has been focused on the crisis in the Persian Gulf, I want to express my unwavering support for Lithuania and the other Baltic States in their peaceful efforts to achieve independence from the Soviet Union. Further, it is essential to send a clear and unequivocal message to the Soviet Union condemning the continued and resurgent Soviet repression in Lithuania and other Baltic Republics. Although I understand President Bush's concerns about provoking the Soviets in light of their support for the United Nations coalition in the Persian Gulf, I am very disappointed with the Bush administration's low-key stance on this brutal repression.

As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Baltic States, I have cosponsored a measure (H. Res. 32) which condemns the recent Soviet actions in the Baltic Republics. The resolution demonstrates my support for Lithuania by imploring Soviet authorities to peacefully resolve the issue of Baltic independence and address the underlying problem of Baltic self-determination.

As I express my strong support for the Lithuanian independence movement, I also want to convey my sincere sympathies to the families of those who were killed in the recent crackdown. Let us hope that their ultimate sacrifice will not be in vain.

In closing, my message to President Gorbachev is clear: If he reverts to the hard-line Soviet political strategy of repression, he risks not only the Soviet Union's improved human rights record through glasnost, but he also jeopardizes his country's improved relations with the United States. The United States cannot allow this type of barbarism to continue.

BRUTAL REPRESSION IN LITHUANIA AND LATVIA

HON. BILL PAXON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, while the attention of the world is focused on momentous issues of war and peace in the gulf, Soviet President Gorbachev has made a mockery of his Nobel Peace Prize by brutally repressing the movement for freedom and independence in the Republics of Lithuania and Latvia.

Gorbachev's timing is no accident.

As they did in Budapest in 1956, and Prague in 1968, in 1991, the Red army fired

on freedom fighters, this time in Vilnius; men, women, and children armed only with sticks, a desire for freedom, and their courage.

As long as the crisis in the Middle East continues, our ability to affect the course of freedom in the Baltics as well as other foreign policy issues with equal moral weight is seriously compromised.

All peace-loving peoples of the world continue to hope and pray that the tyrant Saddam Hussein will end this crisis in what little time remains.

If he does not, we must all understand the overwhelming imperative we face to use appropriate force to bring about Saddam's end quickly is drawn not solely from Middle East issues but from the issue of freedom and independence for all people who fall under the yoke of tyranny and repression.

A UNIFIED AMERICAN FRONT

HON. J. ROY ROWLAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Speaker, this debate is not simply about war and peace. It is about the best way of achieving peace, which is our common goal.

Many people have written and called me to urge support for a resolution requiring President Bush to give sanctions more time and prohibiting the use of military force pending further action by Congress. I understand and respect their feelings. Unfortunately, I am much more pessimistic about sanctions today than I was a few weeks ago. All of the information I have indicates that sanctions are not working and may never work.

Saddam Hussein does not intend to stop with Kuwait. His goal is to expand his military control over the entire gulf region, controlling much of the world's oil reserves. He would then control the economic and military lifeline for much of the world, and he would use this power for destructive purposes. If Hussein were not evicted for Kuwait, the free world would be confronted with an even greater military threat in the future.

We cannot deny the President the military option and expect efforts to seek a peaceful withdrawal to succeed. The Solarz-Michel resolution makes this option available only when all reasonable efforts to seek a peaceful solution are exhausted. The chance for long-term peace and stability in the Middle East is best served by presenting a unified American front against Hussein's aggression.

THE 13TH HOUR PROSPECTS FOR PEACE

HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, less than 12 hours after the United Nations deadline for Iraq to disgorge Kuwait, is the question of whether an eminently avoidable conflict can be averted.

Based on a series of assumptions and presumptions, I would suggest it is possible.

First, the assumptions:

The United States and the international community are precisely correct in their standing before international law and in the resolve to force Saddam to disengage from Kuwait without rewarding him for aggression;

Atrocities continue daily in Kuwait—rapes, torture, executions—which, if unchecked, could over the next several months reach genocidal proportions.

The cause of a prospective U.N. peacekeeping war against Iraq is just, although undesired.

The consequence of such a conflict is impossible to gauge, but the likelihood is that the loss of life will approach Gettysburg proportions on the Iraqi side, with the greatest havoc being wreaked from ordinance dropped or launched from multimile distances.

The possibility is high that Iraq will launch missiles, perhaps chemically tipped, against Israel, in which case Israel will respond, perhaps with nuclear weapons.

The likelihood is that an American decision to employ force will unleash acts of unprecedented terrorism against the United States and its allies on a global basis.

The long-term implications of the United States attacking an Islamic country—however brutally led—is incalculable, but certainly far-reaching; and

No sure scenario exists either for ending the conflict once it commences or dealing with the resulting chaos and psychological scars when it is concluded.

Second, the presumptions:

Based on superior military strength and solid philosophical convictions, the United States can afford and may even have a moral obligation to make a 13th hour demarche to Baghdad;

Such a demarche should not include a compromising of principle, but must reflect an understanding of the basis for discord in the region and a reasonable formula for face-saving for Saddam.

We may rightfully perceive this potential conflict as an international law enforcement exercise against an international brigand, but as brutally uncivilized as Saddam has been in oppressing his own countrymen as well as the Kuwaitis, we must recognize that unless the United States walks the extra mile for peace we could unwittingly turn a tinhorn Hitler into an Islamic Allende. While peacekeeping can in certain contexts such as this one be peace-making, at issue is the oldest paradigm in the Judeo-Christian tradition of governance: the moral imperative for a search for peace.

We must understand that history has taught that more frequently than not "Holy Wars" are led by unholy men, and that Saddam, the medieval satrap, has ordered the words "Allahu Akbar"—"God is Greater"—inscribed on the red, white, and black flag of Iraq. Whether by coercion or inspiration, he apparently holds a more credible hold over his countrymen than an outside observer would assume reasonable or possible.

In this context, the administration might consider offering, preferably before but potentially at an appropriate point after hostilities break

out, a 12-hour pause during which it might suggest the following:

First, that a hot line between Washington and Baghdad be established.

Second, that the President use it to inform Saddam or in the event of demise appropriate Iraqi authorities that a formula for peace could be considered based on four components:

The internationalization of the Rumalia oil fields, with the proceeds of oil revenues going to the poor, especially the children of the region. One of the principal if transparent rationalizations for Iraq's invasion of Kuwait was the claim that the Kuwaitis were stealing oil from the Rumalia field for the benefit of the al-Sabah family rather than the poor and dispossessed of the region. Kuwait is a small country with disproportionate if not unseemly wealth. Ironically, the best way to secure Kuwait's sovereign borders may be to internationalize part of its greatest resource—oil—and redistribute the petroleum profits of a few for the benefit of the many. Using the field as a carrot and ceding its proceeds to the "have nots" of the Arab world could help Saddam save face in an Arab context without allowing him to profit from aggression. At the same time, it might help satisfy Islam's call for Zakat, or almsgiving to the poor;

The agreement of the international community to guarantee the protection of an Iraqi offshore oil unloading facility in the Persian Gulf to serve as a man-made artificial port. To the extent that Iraqi access to the Persian Gulf for a deep-water port has been claimed by Baghdad to be one of those grievances leading to its conflict with Kuwait, the international community could, in the context of an unconditional Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, consider future guarantees for the protection of an Iraqi offshore oil unloading facility. In modern times the definition of a port need not entail the characteristics of a city resting on land. A metal platform may be more durable than a deep-water landing and more useful than a sand-encrusted island;

An agreement to proceed with good faith efforts to establish an international conference dealing with all problems of the Middle East, as envisioned by last month's Security Council resolution that the United States supported. Since America is formally on record in favor of such a conference, it is irrational to suggest we cannot agree to its holding as a condition for peace, presuming, of course, that no conference could convene until Iraq is in full compliance with all the Security Council resolutions applicable to its aggression against Kuwait; and

The Iraqi Government must agree to cease production and destroy under international supervision its chemical and biological weapons arsenals and comply with the constraints of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Alternatively, Saddam should be aware that the precedent of this century is that war criminals must be held accountable for their crimes and that a Nuremberg-like tribunal looms on the horizon should he be apprehended. What, after all, is at stake in the prospective conflict is not traditional warfare with patriotic rationalizations, but criminal behavior abhorred and defined to be illegal by the entire civilized community of nations.

Saddam may aspire to martyrdom, but if he leads his people from prosperity to ruin, if from the cradle of civilization uncivilized judgment is prolonged, he will go down in history as an antiprophet, one of civilization's most injurious criminals.

The world community must thus underscore to Saddam that legal accountability is the real linkage with which an aggressor must deal. Linkages asserted by aggressors, however meritorious the causes espoused, amount to blackmail and must be treated as such.

Nonetheless, it is undeniable that the linchpin of any long-lasting resolution of almost all the disputes in the region rests with efforts to understand and address social and economic inequities in the Arab world. The President is correct in suggesting that formal linkage to other issues is spurious in the Iraqi context when the making of such linkage implies rewarding aggression. On the other hand, whether we prefer it or not a "new world order" implies not only greater attention to international law and international institutions but in the American philosophical tradition "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind." While psychologically difficult, the stronger party in a dispute should feel no compunction against offering precarage settlements which might otherwise be offered in a post-conflict settlement. In this regard, it should be pointed out that the Saudis have at several stages formally indicated they would accept any agreements on territorial issues approved by the Kuwaitis, implying potential acquiescence in an actual Iraqi border shift which the internationalization of the oil fields proposed above explicitly precludes.

Perhaps the most difficult challenge of diplomacy is to put yourself in your adversary's shoes and seek common ground when little seems to exist.

In this context, the administration must understand the admonition of Sun Tzu that "when you surround an army leave an outlet free. Do not press a desperate foe too hard." As the British military historian and strategist B.H. Liddel Hart warned: "Never corner an opponent."

The prospect of a peaceful resolution of this international drama is real, if both sides can come to an understanding that based on Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait good faith efforts can be undertaken to deal with disparities of wealth in the region and the problem of displaced people.

Aggression cannot be rewarded, but Saddam as much as any leader in the world has in his grasp the possibility of changing the stripes of his uniform. Instead of sacrificing thousands of innocents to glorify his stature; instead of continuing to oppress his and the Kuwaiti people, he has the extraordinary opportunity of becoming the champion rather than the slaughterer of the oppressed of the region. Such a tantalizing opportunity to reshape historical judgment as much as the threat of ruin of his own country should give him pause to reconsider the path he has chosen.

In 500 B.C. the Chinese sage Sun Tzu wrote in the classic *The Art of War* that "supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting." Almost a thousand years later, the Roman General

Belisarius counseled that "the most complete and happy victory is this: to compel one's enemy to give up his purpose, while suffering no harm to oneself."

Incredulously, if conflict can be averted, Saddam Hussein and George Bush have the possibility of each coming out of this confrontation with a personal political victory that is good for the region and international order. Obversely, if conflict ensues, one or both will be tarnished, with international order hanging in the balance.

TERM LIMITATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have once again introduced legislation, House Joint Resolution 42, that would limit the number of terms a Member of Congress may serve. This legislation states that no person may be elected to the House of Representatives more than three times and that no person may be elected to the Senate more than once. House terms would continue to have a 2-year duration, and the Senate term would remain at 6 years. If a Member of Congress chooses to run for office in the other body after his or her tenure has expired in the body in which he serves, he or she may do so. Thus, an individual could serve a total of 12 years in Congress.

The purpose of this legislation stretches far beyond the obvious. Certainly, it is necessary to reestablish the true meaning of public service by eliminating the option of making a career out of being a Member of Congress. Instead, the field would be open to men and women who have a sincere interest in representing their constituencies—for the short term. But in addition to this, should this measure be adopted, the makeup of Congress would also benefit, making it a considerably more effective organization. It is indisputable that the leadership in both Houses is impetuous, with little turnover. Every year an exorbitant amount of legislation is never voted on for the simple reason that the committee to which it has been referred is chaired by a well tenured Member, unwilling to give the proposal any consideration.

Those of us who support the idea of term limitation have fallen victim to remarks of critics who claim that if we were indeed supportive of term limitation, we should resign. Without a doubt, I intend to resign following the term in which this legislation is adopted. However, it would obviously be ludicrous for all of the term limitation supporters to vacate their seats in Congress before passage of this resolution, leaving behind few advocates to drum up support for this measure.

Public sentiment in support of this issue is becoming increasingly evident as disgruntled citizens remain dissatisfied with the imperial Congress. Last year we saw a majority of voters in both California and Colorado indicate that they favor term limitation. This legislation would not be a panacea for all ailments plagu-

ing Congress. It would, however, serve to attract individuals to Congress who are indeed interested in serving the people, and not his/her own private interests, and in addition, it would significantly reduce incentives for Members of Congress to vote in accordance with the wishes of wealthy special interests, instead of the will of the constituency. I urge my colleagues to support my resolution, and ask that you resist the temptation to insure yourself a job in Washington, DC for an indefinite period of time, and instead, act as you vowed that you would—in the interest of your constituents.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 17, 1991, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 18

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To hold hearings to examine the state of the economy, focusing on the views of the Federal Government.

SD-608

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JANUARY 23

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings on agricultural trade and agricultural reform in the Soviet Union, focusing on their effect on U.S. agriculture.

SR-332

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the state of the U.S. government two years after President Bush took office, focusing on Desert Shield, the budget, and related issues.

SD-342

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold oversight hearings to review the activities of, and funding for, the Resolution Trust Corporation (RTC).

SD-538

JANUARY 24

10:00 a.m.

Joint Printing

Business meeting, to review congressional printing by the Government Printing Office and other matters concerning GPO.

SR-301

JANUARY 29

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold an organizational business meeting.

SD-366

JANUARY 30

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing for a referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico.

SD-366

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine biological warfare defense, focusing on the Department of Defense research and development program.

SD-342

Rules and Administration

To hold an organizational meeting to consider committee's rules of procedure, committee's budget for 1991, Joint Committee on Printing and the

January 16, 1991

Joint Committee on the Library membership, and other pending legislative and administrative business.

SR-301

FEBRUARY 5

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings on U.S. national energy policy.

SD-366

FEBRUARY 6

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to revise the staff honoraria provision of the Ethics in Government Act of 1989 which bans the receipt of money or anything of value for work performed outside the Government.

SD-342

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings on proposed committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1991 and 1992.

SR-301

FEBRUARY 7

9:30 a.m.

Rules and Administration

To continue hearings on proposed committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1991 and 1992.

SR-301

FEBRUARY 20

9:30 a.m.

Rules and Administration

Business meeting, to consider proposed committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1991 and 1992, and other pending legislative and administrative business.

SR-301

FEBRUARY 21

9:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to review the Procurement Integrity Act.

SD-342